DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 423 810 HE 031 658

TITLE Chancellor's University-Wide Task Force on Campus Safety: Findings, Summary & Recommendations, 1996-1997.

INSTITUTION New York State Univ. System, Albany.

PUB DATE 1997-00-00

NOTE 116p.

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *College Administration; Compliance (Legal); *Educational Environment; Federal Legislation; Higher Education; Law Enforcement; *Long Range Planning; *School Safety; School Security

IDENTIFIERS *State University of New York; Student Right to Know and Campus Security Act

ABSTRACT

This report presents findings and recommendations of a State University of New York (SUNY) university-wide task force on campus safety. The group held meetings, surveyed SUNY campuses, and analyzed references and materials from national and state resources. An overall conclusion was that no single monolithic formula could be applied to all SUNY components. However, broad recommendations that could be adapted to each campus were formulated. The report begins by describing the task force methodology. This is followed by an overview of campus safety legislation and judicial decisions that affect campus safety. This section also considers university initiatives to comply with various state and federal laws, such as the Student Right to Know and Campus Security Act of 1990. Next is an overview of campus departments of public safety, including their historical development and operational authority. The report then presents the specific findings of the three task force subcommittees which examined education, prevention and compliance, and crisis management. Each subcommittee section concludes with recommendations. Appendices include task force correspondence, a list of task force members, and a list of resources. (Contains 60 references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED 423 810

1948

Chancellor's University-Wide Task Force on Campus Safety

FINDINGS, SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS

1996 - 1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 031 658

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

State University of
New York Admin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
COLLEGE AT BROCKPORT

Chancellor's University-Wide Task Force on Campus Safety

FINDINGS, SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS

1996 - 1997

Contents

Executive Summary 3

Task Force Methodology 22

I. Overview of Campus Safety Legislation and Judicial Decisions 28

II. Overview of Campus Public Safety Departments, Their History and Authority 41

III. Findings of the Subcommittees 50

- A. Education Subcommittee 50
- B. Prevention & Compliance Subcommittee 71
- C. Crisis Management Subcommittee 83

Appendices

Appendix A. Creation of the Task Force 89

1. Letter to Chancellor from Student Assembly, December 1994
2. Letter to Dr. Pogue from Campus Safety Planning Committee, December 1994
3. Letter to Chancellor Bartlett from Dr. Pogue, December 1994
4. Letter to Executive Committee of the Student Government Assembly from President, Diego Munoz, July 1995
5. Letter to Chief Student Affairs Administrators from Dr. Pogue, August 1995
6. Letter to Dr. Bruce McBride from Chancellor establishing Task Force, September 1995

Appendix B. Letter to Student Assembly President from Dr. Marion Schrank, June 3, 1996 101

Appendix C. Task Force Membership: Administration and Faculty, Students, Subcommittees 103

Resources 106

Executive Summary—Introduction and Recommendations

Dr. Marion Schrank, Vice President for Student Affairs, Chairperson

Introduction

> Campus crime is not a new development, but on many campuses today, crime has moved from a minor disturbance to a major concern. In fact, evidence indicates that the rate of crime on campuses is nearly the same as society at large. College campuses are no longer sanctuaries or Ivory Towers isolated from other people. They are now part of modern society, and today's college students represent the general population, including its cultural, social, ethnic and religious diversity. It is thus not surprising that crime, sometimes at its worst, has come to campus; the primary problem is how to deal with it. (Gibbs, 1992, p. 49)

Contrary to the beliefs of many, campus safety is not an absolute condition, attainable with sufficient personnel, clear and enforced standards, and state-of-the-art technology. Rather, safety in the college community, as in the larger society, is a complex issue involving a continual search for balance between the conflicting needs for safety versus personal freedom; shared responsibility among the students, the administration, the faculty and staff, and those responsible for campus security; and an open and ongoing communication among those groups, concerning their expectations of one another. The creation of a safe campus requires cooperation from all its constituents—faculty, staff, and students, the neighboring community, and the public—who live, study, research, visit, and work there. However, for the purposes of this report, the emphasis will be on the nearly 370,000 students that SUNY serves.

Certain characteristics of college communities pose particular challenges to those responsible for campus safety. Most apparent are the students themselves. The very nature of higher education is provocative; students are encouraged to be inquisitive, question the status quo, and "test" theories and philosophies. The education of individuals under such conditions is exciting and of immense value to society, yet it can be fraught with tension, hostility and, at times, criminal acts.

Added to this is wide, public access to higher education and the diverse methods and means through which it is delivered. As our institutions mirror our contemporary society, the lines between our campuses, once considered safe havens, and our communities, laden with issues, are no longer clear.

The perception of the safeness of a campus environment has an impact on student recruitment, student retention, and the students' actual academic and social integration experiences. An institution expresses its priorities through its instrumental and symbolic decisions, actions, and communications; that is, by what it *says*, what it *does*, and *who* is involved in *doing it*. From the wording of the college's mission statement, through its policy and practice, to its actual physical campus characteristics, the college provides either a mere perception of, or a realistic commitment to, safety.

Task Force Background

Based on concerns for campus safety, the New York State Legislature, in 1991, passed an amendment to Education Law 6450 requiring that each college and university in the state establish a personal safety committee composed of faculty, staff, and students, and that sexual assault prevention information be presented to all new students. Prior to the passage of this statute, SUNY Board of Trustees policy, in 1986, already required that each campus have a personal safety committee to review campus safety issues and present related recommendations to its campus president for implementation. Similarly, campus safety committees annually prepared reports for university-wide reports on campus safety initiatives.

In the fall of 1995, encouraged by the Student Assembly leadership, the Chancellor appointed a University-wide task force on campus safety, comprised of faculty, students, and staff representative of the geographic and demographic sectors of the State University system. The Chancellor's action reaffirmed the University's commitment to a safe, educational environment, uncompromised by incidents of violence or fear of personal harm, for those who work, study, and live on its divergent campuses. Not only was this committee charged to review existing SUNY safety initiatives and examine their effectiveness; the committee was also instructed to recommend promising models and, if appropriate, policy revision and/or development.

Charge to the Task Force

The task force was not required to explain or discern *why* incidents of violence and crime occurred on campus, but rather to *identify* the "tools," the effective or promising practices, that could have wide applicability within our SUNY system. The objectives outlined the following study areas:

- Assist in *developing and cataloging educational programs* relevant to safety issues;
- *Identify programs* successfully implemented by campus safety committees;
- Review and, if necessary, *recommend changes in University policies and procedures*;
- *Establish response protocols* for serious *crime and disaster incidents* for adoption by campuses; and
- *Identify model programs* addressing campus safety problems.

Early in the process, it was apparent to the committee that the task was extensive and would require an operational framework within which to conduct the research. For that purpose, the committee referenced Burling's work (1995, p. 26) which delineated five elements necessary for a comprehensive campus security plan: 1) education, 2) compliance, 3) prevention, 4) periodic review and modification, and 5) crisis management and investigation. Applying these factors, the committee realigned into three subcommittees to further explore the more extensive areas of 1) education, 2) crisis management, and 3) prevention and compliance.

The subcommittee members researched the problem throughout the 1995–96 academic year. Members held meetings, surveyed SUNY campuses, collected references and materials from national and state resources, and began deliberations. Relevant background material pertaining to state law, federal mandates, judicial decisions, and other statutory requirements related to campus law enforcement were outlined and reviewed. The report of the 1992 SUNY Task Force on Public Safety provided direction and became a significant resource. Ultimately, findings and recommendations were presented by the individual subcommittees.

Recommendations

> Campuses everywhere are inaugurating programs to increase community responsibility and awareness about crime on campus. They have found it a continuing challenge to have concurrently a safe and free campus where different communities of adults can interact freely. Unfortunately many schools find that students do not heed much of the safety advice offered and continue to defeat safety efforts. Campus security (safety) can only exist when collaboration exists among the administration—beginning with the president—the students and campus security personnel. (Kirkland & Siegel, 1994, p. 35)

The following recommendations are summarized from the subcommittee reports, conceptualized from Burling's *Crime on Campus: Analyzing and Managing the Increasing Risk of Institutional Liability* (1991), and modified from Kirkland's and Siegel's *Campus Security: A First Look at Promising Practices* (1994, pp. 10–15). Items offered below the specific recommendations are not necessarily all-inclusive, nor required, but merely presented as examples. The committee recognizes that it may not be practical or necessary for each institution to comply with all of these recommendations, and that individual campuses may elect to develop equivalent alternatives.

Summary of Task Force Recommendations

- *Institutions should affirm their commitment to campus safety in policy and practice through the following:*
    - Institutional mission statements
    - Student handbooks
    - Orientation programs for students and staff
    - Educational forums on diversity, civility, and community
    - "Just" or other community statements that express campus values
    - Procedures to evaluate the admissibility of ex-offenders and applicants with disciplinary records
    - Publication of campus judicial actions and public safety daily logs that serve as a direct and clear record of action
    - Initiatives that include all constituencies represented on campuses: traditional and non-traditional students; on-campus, off-campus, and commuter students; all staff , faculty and guests to campus, including community representatives

- *Institutions must provide clear administrative support and direction for local campus personal safety committees and undertake, if necessary, the following actions:*
  - Reconstitute committees on campuses where inactive
  - Have representative membership to include on-campus and community constituencies
  - Make the committee charge specific to the particular campus environment
  - Remain alert to "special risks" created by demographics or specific circumstances
  - Evaluate/assess safety program initiatives' effectiveness
  - Monitor the "safety climate" via review of reports/statistics/incidents
  - Survey opinions of students, faculty, and staff on perception/"feelings" of safety
  - Orient new students and employees to campus safety
  - Provide opportunity for mediation and other conflict resolution methods to reduce confrontation, competition, and violence

- *Institutions should distribute in writing, in clear, easy-to-understand language, at a minimum, and where appropriate, the following:*
  - Codes of conduct
  - Residence hall guidelines
  - Rules for the maintenance of public order
  - Guidelines to personal safety and crime prevention
  - Key/building access statements
  - Greek system relationship statements
  - Guidelines for reporting bias-related incidents
  - Guidelines for reporting sexual offenses
  - Campus emergency procedures/protocols

- *Institutions must implement a safety communication plan that:*
  - – Communicates the current state of safety on campus through continual reporting and dissemination of crime statistics
  - – Designates a campus spokesperson to communicate current and accurate information to the media
  - – Sponsors prevention activities and educational programs that address basic safety risks both on and off campus
  - – Includes a substantive and rehearsed crisis management plan
  - – Provides a clear emergency notification system

- *Institutions must be vigilant to, and in compliance with, federal, state, and SUNY mandates on crime, particularly in the areas of reporting and sexual assault. This includes:*
  - – Student Right to Know and Campus Security Act of 1990, 20 U.S.C. § 1092
  - – Campus Sexual Assault Victim's Bill of Rights Act of 1991, 20 U.S.C. § 1092 (f) as amended by the Higher Education Amendments of 1992 (S. 1150)
  - – Drug-free Schools and Communities Act of 1989 (34 C.F.R. Part 86)
  - – NYS Education Law § 6450.
  - * *For further information see page 28*

- *Institutions must ensure that Public Safety and Security organizations are professionally organized and managed. This can be enhanced by such things as:*
  - – Continual training that reflects campus needs and responds to the nuances of the higher education setting

  - Innovative policing initiatives, such as bicycle and walking patrols, community policing, neighborhood watch programs, and Operation ID
  - Crime prevention and other educational programming especially designed for commuters, international students, students with disabilities, student athletes, physical plant staff, fraternity and sorority members, and library staff
  - Posting, publishing, and distributing safety reminders (e.g., whistles, flashlights, key chains, calendars, post-it emergency numbers) as part of awareness programming
  - Event policy and crowd management procedures in writing and widely disseminated
  - Student Medical Response Teams—typically dispatched through Public Safety—who provide first-response medical care in emergency situations
  - Involving staff in alternative dispute resolution programs such as mediation and peer advocacy services
  - Maintaining a widely publicized 24-hour telephone number for reporting crimes and/or emergencies
  - Reporting and documenting criminal and security incident occurrence to identify trends, to direct initiatives, and for legislative compliance

  * *For further information see page 41*

- *Institutions should design environmentally safe physical facilities that are characterized by:*
  - Adequate lighting and trimmed landscaping
  - Comprehensive exterior and interior emergency phone systems
  - Clear and visible walkways and directories

- Key lock or access card systems
- Escort and shuttle services, walking patrols
- Electronic security systems in appropriate offices (computer center labs, bookstores, etc.)
- Closed-circuit monitors in building lobbies, computer labs, parking lots/garages, library desks, business office service counters
- Weapons detection systems in areas where numerous student and visitor/guest crowds gather (ballroom, athletic facilities, gymnasiums, student union, etc.)
- Regular fire drills and safety inspections
- Plans that ensure facilities and systems are maintained and operational

- *Institutions should utilize technology to enhance personal and campus safety programs, for example:*
  - Home Page and Internet access to disseminate safety information, policies and procedures, offer advocacy and support, publish outcomes of judicial activity
  - Interactive communication systems, helplines or e-mail accounts to promote rumor control, dispense accurate information, and respond to questions
  - Campus communication systems (e.g., cable TV, Internet, voice mail) for crisis management and response coordination

- *Institutions should have a clearly articulated, understandable judicial system that includes:*
  - Clear statements regarding proscribed conduct and prohibited behaviors
  - Lists of sanctions/interventions that the campus may impose
  - Clear hearing and appeals systems that reflect due process

  - Understandable procedures for filing complaints
  - Support and information services available for victims and alleged perpetrators
  - Appropriate coordination with the criminal justice system
  - Mediation/conflict resolution alternatives
  - Timely communication of outcomes as appropriate
  - *A model code begins on page 79*

- *Institutions should have a Victim's Assistance Program to provide the following as necessary:*
  - Help in reporting crime to the appropriate authorities
  - Support and advocacy services (e.g., networks or teams of trained faculty, students, and staff)
  - Psychological and medical services
  - Specialized aid for victims of sexual assault and rape
  - Support for secondary victims such as roommates and friends/family of the victim
  - Access or referral to support for victims/witnesses in the criminal justice system
  - Options for academic adjustments
  - "Safe Room" accommodations for students who are victimized (staffed by volunteers or advocates to provide ongoing support)
  - Access to outcomes of judicial proceedings as warranted

- *Institutions give special consideration to residence halls such as:*
  - Secured and limited access to exterior doors
  - 24-hour locked exterior doors

  - Window and door lock/checking procedures
  - Room door viewers and first-floor-room window safety screens
  - Lock systems that require students to use electronic cards or keys
  - Routine public safety patrols of residence halls and surrounding areas
  - Programs that encourage understanding between public safety and residents (community policing, Neighborhood Watch)
  - Continual safety reminders and educational programs for students
  - Monitoring of doors electronically, alerting public safety when left ajar
  - Staff door monitors at designated times (resident assistants, night hosts)
  - Regular fire drills, safety inspections (including elevators, smoke detectors, and fire alarm apparatus)
  - Guest policies that emphasize expectations and accountability

- *Institutions give special consideration to the off-campus/commuter student community through:*
  - Goals set, in terms of education and prevention, that address the safety of students who reside in private residences or rental property in neighborhoods, as well as residence hall students who frequent these areas
  - Cooperative efforts with local police, fire, and code enforcement officials to improve student safety off campus
  - Educating landowners, who rent to students, about personal safety and the accommodations they can provide for renters
  - Review and improvement of campus parking lot safety
  - Regular reminders and initiatives designed specifically for the unique safety needs of commuter students

  - Communication response systems that respond to incidents of discrimination and prejudice commuter students might encounter off campus
  - Additional communication vehicles that address the needs and concerns of off-campus groups
  - Shuttle bus and escort services for students attending evening and late night classes, and increased parking lot supervision

- *Institutions should address the issues of alcohol and other substance abuse through:*
  - Continual information and education campaigns using trained peer educators whenever possible
  - Promotion of campus intolerance for illegal drug use and underage drinking and abuse
  - Promotion of campus norms which foster responsibility in alcohol use and minimize reliance on alcohol for socializing among students, faculty, and staff
  - Prevention and intervention programs, including risk reduction behaviors
  - Screening and referral services for students needing treatment
  - Targeted campus programming toward high-risk groups, such as Greek organizations, freshmen students, and athletes
  - An established campus alcohol and substance abuse program to be guided by a steering committee authorized to address policy and practice
  - Evaluation and assessment of the impact of alcohol and other substance abuse on student learning
  - Prevention and reduction services through grant research and/or other means

  * *For further information see page 59*

- *Institutions should give special consideration to bias-related violence through:*
    - Campus-wide prevention and intervention programs and strategies
    - Statements from leadership denouncing such behavior and affirming strong commitment to diversity and multicultural understanding
    - Establishment of campus climates that foster just, open, and civil communities
    - Campus-based cultural awareness training/education to sensitize the community to the consequences of discrimination, hate speech, and bias-related violence
    - Classification and reporting of incidents (hotline)
    - Peer advocacy and mediation services
    - 24-hour counseling and referral services for victim and/or group
    - Forums that encourage open dialogue that are both preventive and responsive to incidents
    - Immediate response systems to address behaviors (graffiti removal policy, harassing phone call protocols, trained intervention teams to meet with victims and perpetrators)
    - Orientation activities that emphasize attitudes and values held by the institution
    - Student involvement in setting community standards
    - Workshops that target non-resident students on issues of bigotry and prejudice

    * *For further information see page 63*

- *Institutions should give special consideration to physical assault, harassment, and aggravated assault through:*
    - Information, education, and prevention programs that utilize passive and active resources, such as print and electronic media, guest speakers, and peer theater

  - Safety and self-defense workshops targeted to specific groups, such as runner safety seminars for joggers and anti-hazing seminars for Greek organizations
  - Policies that swiftly address these issues
  - An established review committee that monitors training effectiveness
  - An established safety review team that evaluates breaches of safety and recommends action, as appropriate

  * *For further information see page 57*

- *Institutions should give special consideration to sexual assault prevention through:*
  - Information, education, and prevention programs that utilize passive and active resources, such as print and electronic media, guest speakers, and peer theater
  - 24-hour counseling and referral services; hotline telephone services for reporting incidents
  - Education and dissemination of information regarding the relationship between alcohol consumption and date rape
  - Presence of, and coordination by, a sexual assault prevention committee to ensure compliance and to monitor activity

  * *For further information see page 51*

- *Institutions should give special consideration to sexual harassment prevention through:*
  - Information, education, and prevention programs that utilize passive and active resources, such as print and electronic media, guest speakers, and peer educators
  - SUNY System's Affirmative Action Office for training materials and information
  - "Train the trainers" programs that include faculty, staff, and students to serve

as local resources for assistance
  - Particular attention to the concept of "peer" sexual harassment

  * *For further information see page 54*

- *Institutions should give special consideration to Greek letter organizations through:*
  - Policies relating to formation, recognition, and continuing relationship with the university
  - Policies relating to the behavior of off-campus fraternities and sororities
  - Advocacy and support provided through advisors and advisory boards

- *Institutions should give special consideration to athletes through:*
  - Athletic staff commitment to a drug- and alcohol-free environment
  - Athletic departments' intolerance of violations of University codes of conduct and local laws

- *Institutions should give special consideration to night staff employees and remote campus sites used for study, practice, and research through:*
  - Specific interventions that address evening and late night safety (parking lot supervision, escort services, shuttle buses, safety patrols)

- *Institutions should strengthen campus/community relations through:*
  - Standards for University-owned and/or -recognized student housing in the community
  - Active and cooperative prevention education programs
  - Community/campus programs to decrease crime (Neighborhood Watch)

  - Cooperative efforts that reduce nuisance behavior (good neighbor committees)
  - Campus media advertising that discourages publicizing abusive drinking specials
  - Overall strategies that enhance communication and partnerships

- *Institutions should develop a comprehensive crisis management plan that includes:*
  - Planning focused on the specific level of crisis or emergency
  - Emergency management elements such as a communication team and a training schedule
  - Rehearsed crisis procedures; related written protocols
  - Support services for primary and secondary victims
  - Integration with community and/or regional emergency management plans
  - Procedures to return to normalcy following the event/crisis
  - Continued evaluation and modification as warranted
  - *A model plan, based on specified levels of crisis, is contained on pages 84-88 of this report*

Related Recommendations:

- *SUNY's University Police Proposal recommends the creation of the title of University Police Officer in the Criminal Procedure Law. Although the Task Force was not charged to review this proposal, it sees it as an important, related issue that needs further examination.*

- *The Task Force recommends that SUNY's proposal to include questions on the*

University-wide admissions application form, inquiring if an applicant has been convicted of a felony or dismissed from a college or university for disciplinary reasons, be favorably reviewed and acted upon.

- *The Task Force recommends that SUNY coordinate a "Committee on Campus Safety" that regularly brings together several constituencies (e.g., public safety, student affairs, physical plant, student government, judicial affairs, faculty senate, legal affairs, community officials) on college campuses and from System Administration, to evaluate and recommend new and effective methods for the improvement of campus safety. The Task Force further recommends that independent colleges within the state be invited to participate. Although there are pre-existing networks and organizations within each of the constituencies mentioned above, the opportunity for each of these to interact and communicate does not currently exist.*

Executive Summary Conclusion

> Two points must be made by way of introduction. One is that there is no "right answer" to how much or what kind of security a campus should have. American colleges and universities are too diverse in size, location, applicable law and risk, to claim that there is one universal formula. Second, too much devotion to preventing crime on campus, is almost worse than too little. Students locked away from themselves, let alone the outside world, cannot be educated. It is essential that the tension between an ideal academic environment and an entirely safe campus, be understood by campus administrators and judges alike. (Burling, 1991, p. 26)

The Task Force on Campus Safety concluded that there was no one, monolithic formula applicable to every campus. The 34 state-operated and 30 community colleges that comprise the State University of New York System—the largest public institution of higher learning in the world—are each unique and varied in their characteristics. Each individual unit was determined to be too diverse in student body, mission, academic program, size, and location, to permit a simplistic solution. As a result, it was considered more practical to develop broad recommendations that could be suited to each particular campus. It was, therefore, the consensus of the task force members to articulate recommendations/planning goals that each campus could realistically attain, and to identify resources to enable campuses to achieve them.

This system-wide diversity—truly one of SUNY's great strengths—provided the task force with a multitude of variations on the many safety issues common to college campuses, and an equal variety of institutional approaches to these problems. The result was this series of recommendations that the committee believes will serve as a general plan of action for all SUNY colleges and universities, to be adapted by each, according to their particular special characteristics, needs, and resources. This approach thus enables each institution to design and implement its own appropriate response to achieve reasonable campus safety.

Valuing our System's diversity and recognizing our public mission, it should be understood that these recommendations would need to be reviewed by campus authorities and tailored to determine individual campus value, need, and potential effectiveness.

Format of the Report

The report begins with the task force methodology, followed by an overview on campus safety legislation and judicial decisions that effect campus safety. This section also includes university initiatives to comply with various state and federal laws, such as the Student Right to Know and Campus Security Act of 1990. This discussion is followed by an overview on campus departments of public safety, including their historical development and operational authority.

Following these two background sections, the report then presents the detailed findings of the three task force subcommittees: education, prevention and compliance and crisis management. Each subcommittee section includes a number of subtopics related to each area and, when possible, examples of campus programs and policies. Each section concludes with a list of overall recommendations that may be used by each campus.

The appendices in this report include correspondence that detail the development of the Task Force. A list of Task Force members appears on pages 103 and 104. Finally, the report concludes with a listing of publications, video tapes and other resources, that may be used for further background or investigation into the multitude of topics related to personal safety.

Background and Summary of the Charge to the Task Force

The University Student Assembly, through a collaborative effort with System Administration Office of Student Affairs, outlined recommendations to establish a task force on campus safety (Appendix A, 1–6). In December 1994, the Student Assembly and the Campus Safety Planning Committee submitted a recommendation to the Chancellor to establish a task force on campus safety. Such a task force had been under consideration for a period of time. The issue of campus safety had received a great deal of national discussion, including a number of dramatic examples from SUNY campuses, and the time had come for a proactive step by State University, Discussion on the necessity of creating this task force outlined a number of common conditions and situations that were specific to the nature and environment of each institution and how those factors contributed to campus violence and personal safety.

As a result, Dr. Bartlett announced the establishment of a University-wide Task Force on Campus Safety that would convene in the fall of 1995. The Task Force would be chaired by Dr. Marion Schrank, Vice President for Student Affairs at SUNY Brockport, and would consist of faculty, students and staff representative of the various geographic and demographic regions of the state, and include the various organizational levels within the State University system.

The objectives of the Task Force would be to:

1) Assist in developing and cataloging educational programs about safety issues;

2) Identify programs successfully started by campus safety committees;

3) Review and, if necessary, recommend changes in University policies and practices;

4) Establish response protocols for serious crimes and disaster incidents that campuses might adopt;

5) Identify model programs addressing campus safety problems.

The Task Force was charged to gather national information as well as present response models and programs that could be used extensively throughout the University. It was decided that background material used to develop *The Final Report of the 1992 University-wide Task Force on Public Safety* would be available for this discussion.

The following is a review of Task Force meetings and the formation of subcommittees to address three main areas: Education, Prevention and Compliance, Crisis Management.

In September, 1995, Dr. Schrank sent a letter to the selected members outlining the five areas for study. Dr. Schrank's goal was to examine the issue throughout the academic year and present a report to the Chancellor in the fall semester, 1996. To enable this ambitious time frame and to work within the schedules of a large and busy group of faculty, staff and students, Dr. Schrank proposed that the Task Force meet as a whole on four occasions. The first meeting was scheduled for October 20, 1995, at System Administration.

In anticipation of this first discussion, data was collected in advance and made available at the meeting in October. Thus, in September, Dr. Schrank sent a request via e-mail to colleagues university-wide, explaining the committee, its charge and objectives. The request asked campuses with model programs in place to share the information with the committee by answering the following six questions pertaining to the five basic components of a comprehensive, campus personal safety plan: *education, prevention, periodic review and modification, crisis management and investigation.*

Q1) Please list educational programs currently being offered in the area of personal safety. Examples might include programs dealing with bias-related incidents, substance abuse, sexual assault, residence hall security, crime prevention, facilities maintenance, etc.

Q2) Please list prevention programs offered at your campus dealing with personal safety issues. Examples might include staffing; training of personnel (including students) on topics such as mediation services, sensitivity and awareness training, counseling programs, and first aid; grounds security that might include lighting and landscaping protocols, emergency phones, and escort and shuttle services; and housing supervision and access issues such as key or locking systems, visitation policies, levels of supervision, etc.

Q3) Please list those procedures and policies currently in use that ensure compliance with laws affecting campus safety. Examples might include disciplinary codes, maintenance of files detailing crime statistics, publishing of crime statistics, reporting procedures, specific programs mandated to deal with issues of sexual assault, hazing, and drug and alcohol abuse, etc.

Q4) Please identify procedures and protocols in use for the periodic review of safety issues. Examples may include such things as incidence response protocols, health and counseling protocols, campus safety committee needs assessments, lighting surveys, first aid, and other training, etc.

Q5) Please list any overarching crisis management protocols that deal with safety emergencies and crisis situations. Examples might include protocols for dealing with controversial speakers, students with psychiatric disorders, campus response to media, etc.

Q6) Finally, what is the one most effective thing you do on your campus in the area of personal safety?

First Meeting

At the October 20, 1995 meeting of the Task Force, Dr. Schrank welcomed the members, provided an introduction, and presented an overview of the charge from the Chancellor. Dr. Schrank introduced Dr. Bruce McBride, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Public Safety, and Ms. Gladys Gould, Director of Student Affairs Programming and Training.

Dr. McBride defined the problem through his perspective and reviewed material and data collected and contained in the folders that were distributed to each member. Dr.

McBride also provided a summary of Personal Safety Legislation and University Policy including an overview of Federal Law, State Law and University Policy pertaining to campus safety. Regarding the issue of campus safety, Dr. McBride focused on both college and individual needs. Ms. Gould provided an overview of SUNY Personal Safety Annual Reports and highlighted several campus programs of note.

General discussion followed, establishing the direction for the research with a motion to divide the Task Force into three subcommittees. The following outlines the chair, facilitator, membership, and objectives of each subcommittee.

A. Education: Maximizing Safety

Chairperson: Hal Payne
Facilitator: Gladys Gould
Membership: Dallas Bauman, Tom Gebhart, Edward Jones and Richard Reese

The objective of this subcommittee was to focus on educational programs relevant to safety issues that exist both external and internal to SUNY. The subcommittee was to "investigate programs that educate all members of the campus community to maximize their safety as well as that of others on campus." As programs/policies were identified as having been successfully implemented on campuses, they could be catalogued and shared. Possible areas for consideration included, but were not limited to, orientation activities, residential programs, video series and video-conferencing, curricular inclusion of safety and security data, drug and alcohol education, bias-related/prejudice reduction programs, acquaintance rape initiatives, leadership development opportunities, and advanced technological methods for teaching and communicating.

B. Prevention and Compliance

Chairperson: Christine Strong
Facilitator: Marion Schrank
Membership: Marti Anne Ellermann, Robert Garrow, Thomas Ryan

The objective of this subcommittee was to determine if comprehensive crime prevention systems and compliance procedures existed that were tailored to the specific needs of the individual campuses. The subcommittee would examine state and federal mandates regarding campus crime, individual campus models of preventive programming, and protocols for responding in times of potential harm or crisis. The subcommittee was charged to review disciplinary codes, systems for gathering and distributing crime statistics, and methods for reporting all crime, but especially sexual and bias-related violence. Areas of consideration should include training of personnel, security of buildings and grounds, and campus climate as it related to crime and crime prevention.

C. Crisis Management

Chairperson:	John Coffey
Facilitator:	Bruce McBride
Membership:	Richard Collier, James Grant, Peter Sanzen

The objective of this subcommittee was to inquire as to what campus systems were in place for the prompt, efficient management of both routine and extreme emergency/crisis situations. Possible areas for the subcommittee to consider included periodic review of routine safety issues, crisis/disaster/emergency protocols, and communication protocols. Other suggested areas for inquiry included, but were not limited to, natural disasters, controversial speakers, and workplace and domestic violence.

Therefore, it was resolved that each member would participate on a subcommittee. Each subcommittee would assume its direction from the Chancellor's original charge listing the five objectives. The subcommittee chairs would review the objectives and adopt those specific to their purpose. The subcommittees would meet regionally, or electronically through E-mail or conference calls, and report on their progress and findings at the next meeting, which was to be held on February 2, 1996.

Second Meeting

The second meeting of the University-wide Task Force on Campus Safety was scheduled in Albany on Friday, February 2 from 11:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m. The objectives of this meeting were to:

- Update the large group and then break into working subcommittees
- Review and prepare information collected from campuses related to each subcommittee's agenda
- Consult large group and set agenda for the next meeting

Third Meeting

The third meeting of the Task Force was scheduled for Thursday, April 11, 1996, in Albany, from 11:00 a.m.–3:00 p.m.

The focus of this meeting was a presentation by chairs to the full Task Force of a rough draft of their subcommittee's section of the final report. All of the chapter writers and subcommittee chairs provided a thorough update and description of their section of the final document. Each subcommittee was reminded of the need to respond to the five objectives guiding the committee's action in the development of the "final" draft report. These areas needed to be addressed in conjunction with the individual subcommittee's charge and definition around the topics of education, crisis management and prevention and compliance.

A formal outline for the final report was accepted. A draft of each subcommittee report was to be sent to Dr. Schrank by June 14, 1996. A complete draft report would be available for review at the Task Force meeting scheduled for Thursday, August 8, 1996.

Fourth Meeting

On August 8, 1996, the Task Force met in Albany to review the first draft of the final report. Revisions were requested and completion of the final report was projected for the end of the first semester, 1996.

I. Overview of Campus Safety Legislation and Judicial Decisions

Marti Anne Ellermann, Associate Counsel, Office of University Counsel

Introduction

This section is included because any discussion of campus safety will be influenced by the statutory requirements for establishing, protecting, and monitoring campus safety, as well as the judicial decisions that create common-law guidelines for campus safety. This section includes state and federal laws and initiatives taken by SUNY to comply with those laws. However, not all statutes that relate to safety are covered here. Statutes such as the Public Employees Safety and Health Act (state version of the Occupational Health and Safety Act) or those calling for smoke-free buildings, for example, do impact on the health and safety of SUNY students and employees, but the scope of this section does not extend that far. Similarly, the topics and cases covered deal with a relatively narrow area of judicial actions and responses to crimes on campus that harm students. This section provides an overview of what actions the University must take to provide for the safety of students, employees and visitors.

Federal Legislation

Student Right to Know and Campus Security Act of 1990 and Amendments of 1992
20 U.S.C.A. §1092 (f); 34 CFR Part 668

1) This law requires campuses to collect and publish campus security policies and campus crime statistics. This information is distributed to all current students and employees every September.

2) The statistics must include information on the number of murders, forcible and non-forcible sex offenses, robberies, aggravated assaults, burglaries, and motor vehicle thefts reported to campus security authorities, or local police agencies, for the most recent calendar year and the preceding two years. Additionally, the number of arrests on campus for liquor law violations, drug abuse violations, and weapons

possession must be included.

The law requires timely reporting to the campus community of crimes considered to be a threat to students and employees.

Part of the report distributed to the campus community must also include the following campus policies:

- A statement of current campus policies for handling campus crimes or other emergencies, including procedures for receiving reports from students and employees

- A statement of current policies for maintaining campus security, including security arrangements for campus housing and off-campus housing maintained by fraternities, sororities, or other student organizations

- A statement of current policies concerning campus law enforcement, including:

    1. The enforcement authority of campus security forces and their working relationship with state and local law enforcement agencies

    2. Policies that encourage prompt and accurate reporting of campus crimes to law enforcement authorities

- A description of the type and frequency of programs designed to inform students and employees of campus security procedures and to encourage students and employees to take responsibility for their own safety and the safety of others

- A description of programs designed to inform students and employees about crime prevention

- A statement of policy concerning the monitoring and recording of criminal activity in off-campus student organizations, such as fraternities and sororities

- A description of policies and procedures regarding possession, use, and sale of alcoholic beverages and illegal drugs

- A description of available drug and alcohol abuse programs

SUNY Compliance Actions:

Memoranda to Presidents were distributed advising campuses of the requirements (Memo to Presidents, Vol. 91, No. 3, Aug. 2, 1991; Vol. 92, No. 7, Dec. 30, 1992; Memo to Presidents from Frank Pogue dated Mar. 4, 1994). Regional workshops were held with staff of the Offices of University Public Safety and University Counsel to assist campuses in developing individualized publications and policies to meet the requirements of the Act.

Family Education Rights and Privacy (FERPA)
20 U.S.C.A. §1232 (g); 34 CFR Part §99

The provision allows for disclosure to victims of crimes of violence (as defined in 18 U.S.C.A. §16) of the outcome of a campus disciplinary hearing against the alleged perpetrator of the crime of violence. However, disciplinary hearing records are considered educational records, not law enforcement records, and therefore results of disciplinary hearings cannot be disclosed to the public at large under FERPA. (See Federal Register, Vol. 60, No. 10, p. 3464, January 17, 1995.) The amendment also allows campuses to release certain law enforcement records concerning students, such as arrest records, without the need to obtain student consent.

SUNY Compliance Actions:

Memoranda to Presidents, Vol. 92, No. 7, Dec. 30, 1992 and Vol. 92, No. 3, Aug. 2, 1991 were issued on this subject.

Drug-free Schools

The federal Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988 imposed responsibilities on educational institutions receiving federal grants and contracts, including participation in student financial aid programs. Included were submission of a certification to federal granting agencies that a drug-free workplace will be provided and development of alcohol and controlled substance policy statements which, among other things, notify employees that discipline will be imposed for violations of the laws on controlled substances; and requirements that employees notify campuses of criminal drug convictions. The Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1989 also imposed related requirements. These include: adoption and implementation of a drug prevention program with necessary conduct rules, potential sanctions and descriptions of health risks and treatment programs; and record-keeping on drug-related disciplinary cases.

S.U.N.Y. Compliance Actions:

Memoranda to Presidents, Vol. 89, No. 6, dated April 26, 1989; Vol. 89, No. 15, dated July 27, 1989, and Vol. 90, No. 14, dated Nov. 26, 1990 advised campuses of the statutory requirements. Each campus develops its own policy statements under these provisions.

State Legislation

New York Education Law §6450

Beginning in 1969, the State required trustees of every college in the state to adopt rules and regulations for public order and allowed them to set penalties for violations. Such rules are not expected to restrict free expression or academic freedom, but should be promulgated to prevent abuse of the rights of others. A second element of the law, adopted in 1991, provides for incoming students to be informed of sexual assault prevention measures to be taken by institutions of higher education. The prevention information must be disseminated to incoming students through workshops, seminars, discussion groups, film presentations, or other methods. The information must include applicable laws and regulations on sex offenses as well as penalties for the commission of sex offenses, campus procedures for addressing sex offenses, support services for victims, general information about the incidence of sex offenses on college campuses, and campus methods for informing students about security procedures. The amendment also included a provision that each college shall appoint an advisory committee on campus safety. The committee must be composed of at least six members from faculty, administration, and student constituencies. At least half of the committee must be female.

SUNY Compliance Actions:

SUNY Rules for the Maintenance of Public Order are contained in 8 NYCRR Part 535. See also Memoranda to Presidents, Vol. 77, No. 11, dated May 23, 1977.

Memoranda to Presidents were distributed to campuses advising them of the statutory requirements regarding sexual assault prevention and safety committees (Vol. 86, No. 1, dated Jan. 22, 1986; Vol. 89, No. 18, dated Oct. 2, 1989; Vol. 90, No. 15, dated Dec. 21, 1990). Each campus develops its own orientation program incorporating sexual assault prevention issues.

The creation of advisory committees as required by the state legislation was not new to the University. In 1984, Trustee policy required each campus to form a personal safety committee to deal with women's safety issues. This policy was revised to incorporate a broad area of safety issues, and required that each campus file an annual report.

In 1989 Chancellor Johnstone requested that each campus personal safety committee: 1) review policies on sexual assault; 2) review and suggest improvement in safety education programs; 3) assess availability of counseling services for crime victims; 4) review victim referral and campus response procedures for sexual assault situations; and 5) continue ongoing assessment of the quality of campus personal safety policies, practices, procedures, and programs.

The University revised its policies to conform with federal and state requirements. The campus report on personal safety is filed with the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Special Programs and includes the names of members of the advisory committee and activities undertaken during the academic year.

New York State Family Protection and Domestic Violence Intervention Act of 1994 (Chapter 222, Laws of 1994)

The legislative intent of this Act was to provide for stronger interventions in the area of domestic violence, in part through immediate deterrent action by law enforcement officers and stronger criminal penalties. Deterrent action is accomplished through a mandatory arrest provision when a felony has been committed against another member of the family or household, an order of protection has been violated, or a misdemeanor family offense has been committed. However, the definition of family or household as written in the law may incorporate incidents between non-married or non-related individuals, which is the scenario most likely to arise on college campuses. The requirements apply to police and peace officers, including SUNY Public Safety Officers. The Act provides for concurrent jurisdiction in both family court and criminal court over cases involving domestic violence, removing the former requirement that victims choose one forum or the other. Victims of domestic or family violence are also given more information through a mandatory victim notice requirement about their options to go to a safe place, receive medical attention and/or seek an order of protection.

SUNY Compliance Actions:

SUNY Directors of Public Safety have attended educational programs provided by the New York State Office on the Prevention of Domestic Violence on this legislation and campuses have adopted domestic violence response protocols.

SUNY Policies:

Ex-offenders Admissions Policy—Memorandum to Presidents (Vol. 81, No. 9, August 14, 1981).

It is the policy of SUNY to provide appropriate educational and rehabilitative services for inmates and ex-offenders. Admissions applications received from inmates and ex-offenders are to be evaluated and judged on their own merits. Campuses may not discriminate against individuals who have previously been convicted of criminal offenses (N.Y. Correction Law §750 et seq.), but a campus may deny an application for admission based on the prior conviction when the admission "would involve an unreasonable risk to property or the safety or welfare of specific individuals or the general public" (N.Y. Corrections Law §752). The decision as to whether or not to admit is highly dependent upon a number of factors that may be different from campus to campus, such as the residential or commuter character of the campus, academic programs, support staff available, etc., and therefore each college is able to develop its own admissions policies and procedures pursuant to the Corrections Law. Generally, an admissions committee, after procuring appropriate information from prison records and obtaining recommendations from prison officials and parole officers, will consider questions such as the type of crime committed, the ex-offender's history of convictions, behavior during incarceration, any relationship between the crime committed and a possible professional license being sought, and the interplay between the offense and the availability of rehabilitative services available at the college. If a decision to admit is made, the admissions committee will consider issues such as living arrangements, assignment of counselors, and any other conditions of admission. In many cases, the campus will receive information about an ex-offender from a parole officer, and a campus may request additional information from an applicant if it becomes aware of his/her inmate or ex-offender status.

This policy is currently being reviewed, and a proposal has been made to include questions on the University-wide application form to ascertain if an applicant has been convicted of a felony or dismissed from a college or university for disciplinary reasons. Applicants responding "yes" would be subject to further review by the campus admissions committee under the standards described above.

Possession, Storage, Care and Use of Firearms on State-Operated Campuses—
Administrative Procedure Manual Item 080.1, August 26, 1992; 8 NYCRR Part 590

Regulations of the Board of Trustees prohibit the possession of a firearm on SUNY campuses without the written authorization of the Chief Administrative Officer of the campus. These rules of the Board of Trustees apply to firearms, rifles, air guns, or shotguns. Possession of a valid New York state pistol permit does not authorize that person to have a firearm on campus without written authorization by the Chief

Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer of a campus may provide authorization for public safety personnel designated as peace officers to carry firearms while on duty. Officers designated as peace officers under §355 of the Education Law are not exempt from the firearms licensing requirement of the Penal Law (§265.20). A campus public safety officer may use the firearm only when all reasonable means for protection have been exhausted and the officer reasonably believes that the use of deadly force against him/herself or another person is imminent.

Judicially Imposed Standards

Generally, a student who has been a victim of a crime on campus will allege that the college or university was negligent in failing to provide adequate security, failing to provide safe premises, or failing to warn of dangerous acts or individuals in the area. Following is a brief overview of how some of these issues have been analyzed by the courts.

Basic elements needed to show negligence:

For a plaintiff to prevail in a negligence suit, three things must be shown to have existed: 1) duty, 2) breach of duty, and 3) causation.

Background

The doctrine of *in loco parentis* is regularly discussed in the context of the relationship between college and student, particularly in connection with the issue of college liability or responsibility for injuries suffered by students. The term *in loco parentis* means standing in the place of a parent. It was first used in 1770, in Blackstone's Commentaries on English Law, to describe the relationship of school master to pupil, and applied to the discipline of students. Teachers were seen as having been delegated parental authority for the restraint and correction of students. The earliest American reference to this term appears in 1837 in a criminal case against a teacher arising out of the corporal punishment of a pupil. The *in loco parentis* relationship was argued as a defense by the teacher of his use of corporal punishment. Much later, the term was used by the courts to uphold college authority to regulate or prohibit student activities and conduct, such as the joining of "secret societies" or the frequenting of "forbidden" off-campus places.

In the 1960s, significant changes in the judicial approach towards the college-student relationship took place. Judges began to scrutinize student discipline under constitutional principles of free speech, due process, and search and seizure. Beginning with the case of Dixon v. Alabama, a student disciplinary challenge, courts moved away from the doctrine of *in loco parentis* as a basis for refusing to review student discipline.

None of this early litigation in the discipline context applied the term to the duty of a university to exercise reasonable care in maintaining a safe learning environment. However, over time the argument began to appear that, since these student rights cases gave rise to freedom for students, they (and their parents) could no longer expect to be protected by the university. It was as if a "custodial" relationship between the university and its students was a precondition to the imposition on the university of a duty to act with reasonable regard for students' safety. Courts spoke regularly of the "demise" of *in loco parentis* and linked this phenomenon to limitations on a university's duty to provide a safe environment. Thus was born the "no duty" rule which today is generally applied by courts asked to review university liability for injuries to students arising out of criminal acts or any other alleged lack of safety on campuses. The recent case which epitomizes the expression of the "no duty" rule is Bradshaw v. Rawlings (617 F. 2d. 135 [1979]) where a college was found not liable for injuries to a student suffered in an automobile accident following an off-campus picnic sponsored by the college's sophomore class. The court said "the modern American college is not an insurer of the safety of its students," relying on the finding that college students are "adults."

With this underlying assumption in mind, this analysis will now return to the specific standards for liability for campus safety under applicable judicial decisions. Each of the necessary elements (duty, breach, causation) of a negligence case will be reviewed in turn.

1) Duty

As mentioned above, the courts have generally found that universities have "no duty" towards their students with regards to ensuring their safety. Two modifications or exceptions to this rule have been created, however: where the university acts in its capacity as a "landlord" in maintaining the security of its residence halls, and where there is a "special relationship" with a particular student.

The concept of a special relationship is based on the public policy argument that the state owes a duty to all citizens as a group, but not to each citizen as an individual. To show that a special duty exists, it must be shown that there was an assumption of an affirmative duty by the state entity, the state entity knew that the inaction would lead to harm, there was direct contact between the state entity and the injured party, and the injured party must have relied on the state entity for protection. Campus policies regulating behavior, including policies that prohibit drinking on campus, are not enough to establish a special duty. Since guidelines regulating behavior are not designed to protect or benefit specific individuals, the presence of policies does not indicate that the state has taken an affirmative step, by promise or act, to provide protection to specific individuals (Donovan v. State of New York, Court of Claims, Claim No. 90866, Filed April 12, 1995). Even the fact that a person is in danger of becoming a victim of a crime, no matter how real or imminent, does not by itself create a special duty (Dutton v. City of Olean, 60 A.D. 2d 335; Nieswand v. Cornell University, 692 F. Supp. 1464 [N.D.N.Y. 1988]).

State University/state-owned property cases—proprietary capacity versus government capacity

The state is seen as performing both proprietary and governmental functions. It has been determined by the courts in New York state that proprietary functions include when the state is acting as a "landlord" in the operation of campus residence halls (Miller v. State, 62, NY 2d 506). As noted above, if the state is found to be negligent while acting as a landlord (a proprietary function), then the state will be held liable. In order for a landlord to be found negligent it must have failed to provide "minimal security measures" Green v. State (1994), McGraw v. State—NYS 2d (1995).

A landlord has a duty to exercise reasonable care under the circumstances to maintain its property in a safe condition, but a landlord is not held to be an insurer of safety. The state is held to the same standard as a private landlord in the maintenance of physical security devices in the residence halls. Therefore, a college or university has a duty to repair unsafe conditions which it is aware of, such as door or window locks that do not work, and will be expected to take reasonable measures to secure exterior doors and address other building security problems. (Miller v. New York, 62 N.Y. 2d 506; Mullins v. Pine Manor College, 449 N.E. 2d 331 [Mass. 1983]; Delaney v. University of Houston, 835, S.W. 2d 56)

By contrast, public entities remain immune from negligence claims arising out of performance of their governmental functions. "Governmental functions" include police and security functions (see Bodie v. State, 1992). Provision of security to protect against the acts of third parties is a governmental function. Therefore, a state entity will not be held liable for failing to provide security against the acts of third parties unless a "special relationship" has been established between the injured party and the state entity. Thus, where a non-student was attacked in a campus building after it was closed, the state was acting in its governmental capacity in providing security for the building, and was not liable for the injury sustained by the claimant. (Laura O. v. State, 202 AD 2d 559, 610 NYS 2d 533; Adams v. State, 210 AD 2d 273 [1994]; Marilyn S. v. City of New York, 134 AD 2d 583, *affd* 73 NY 2d 910; Bonner v. City of New York, 73 NY 2d 930)

Events occurring off campus

The college's general obligation to maintain the campus free of foreseeable harm does not extend to students leaving campus. A college does not stand *in loco parentis* to its students, even if they have not yet reached the age of majority, and therefore there is no duty to supervise students after they leave campus (Hartmann v. Bethany College, 778 F. Supp 286 [N.D. W.Va. 1991]). Similarly, it has been held that the State is not an insurer of the off-campus safety of its adult students in the context of a murder of a student on an off-campus bike path where there had been prior violent incidents (Yalem v. State, Court of Claims, decided December 19, 1995).

Duty to warn students of dangerous events or individuals

A college may be held to a duty to warn students of a pattern of similar events in one location. Additionally, statutory language in the Campus Security Act now mandates that there be a system of communicating information about dangerous crimes on campus to students and staff. However, the New York Court of Appeals has held that a college or university is under no duty to warn other students that a formerly incarcerated individual is enrolled as a student, and that the institution has no duty to restrict the former prisoner's activity on campus (Peterson v. San Francisco Community College, 685 P. 2d 1193 [Cal. 1984]; Eiseman v. State, 70 N.Y. 2d 175, 511 N.E. 2d 1128; 518 NYS 2d 608 [1987]). A therapist may be held to have a duty to warn a foreseeable third party of danger from a patient. This duty to warn first arises from the special relationship between the patient and therapist. Once the special relationship has been formed, a two-step analysis must take place. First, the professional must use the reasonable degree of skill and care ordinarily possessed by members of that specialty to predict if the patient poses a serious danger to others. Once the determination has been made that the patient does pose a serious danger to others, the professional must exercise reasonable care to protect the foreseeable victim of that danger. Obviously, this holding is somewhat limited in that a "special relationship" must exist, the individual with the duty to warn must be a "professional," and there must be an identifiable possible victim (Tarasoff v. Regents of the University of California, 17 Cal. 3d 452, 131 Cal. Rptr. 14, 551 P. 2d 334).

2) Breach of Duty

A college will have breached its duty if it fails to take minimal precautions to protect its students from the reasonably foreseeable acts of third persons. If a student can show that there was a reasonably foreseeable likelihood of criminal intrusion into a campus building, then breach of duty may be established. Cases vary as to whether a building's location in a high crime area is enough, in and of itself, to establish foreseeability. Essentially, the question comes down to whether the landlord should have anticipated a risk of harm to visitors or tenants. Courts have held that reports of intruders in the building or on campus and a fairly regular incidence of other crimes should put a campus "on notice," and may lead to a finding of foreseeability and therefore, breach of duty (Nieswand v. Cornell University, 692 F. Supp 1464 [N.D.N.Y. 1988]; Miller v. New York, 62 N.Y. 2d 506; Skaria v. State of New York, 110 Misc. 2d 711 [1981]; Nallan v. Helmsley-Spear, Inc., 50 N.Y. 2d 507 [1980]; Mullins v. Pine Manor College, 449 N.E.

2d 331 [Mass. 1983]). Some courts have found that the prior incidents must have been "substantially similar" to the incidents that are the basis of the litigation. Reports of "peeping toms," burglary and petty thefts, and a vagrant in a residence hall were not found to be so similar to a later sexual assault that they created knowledge on the college's part of an unreasonable risk to students (Savannah College of Art and Design, Inc. v. Roe, 261 Ga. 764, 409 S.E. 2d 848; Jacqueline S. v. City of New York, 81 NY 2d 288). The Court of Claims held that SUNY was not liable for a rape that occurred in a residence hall when, of the approximately fifteen incidents in the two years prior to the rape, all but two were merely reports of "suspicious" persons, and only one of the fifteen incidents involved violence. The court held that a crime in the nature of rape or assault was not foreseeable to SUNY prior to the rape involved in the claim (Green v. State of New York, Claim No. 76566, Filed April 19, 1994).

3) Causation

The state's breach of duty must have been the cause of the injury to the student.

II. Overview of Campus Public Safety Departments, Their History and Authority

Bruce McBride, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Public Safety

History

Law enforcement services for state-operated campuses are provided by campus departments of public safety, which are found at 27 campuses. As outlined in the "Manual of Rules," their mission is defined according to the following principles:

1) The provision of quality law enforcement services to the campus community

2) The maintenance of high standards for personal and professional ethics and protection of constitutional rights

3) The recognition that law enforcement personnel are part of the educational process in the campus community

4) The importance of consultations, teamwork, and open discussions with campus constituencies on law enforcement-related safety matters

5) The appreciation of diversity on campuses

Campus public safety officers are defined as peace officers in the education and criminal procedure laws. They have the following law enforcement powers that are statutorily given to police officers:

1) To make warrantless arrests based on probable cause

2) To execute arrest warrants

3) To issue appearance tickets

4) To issue uniform traffic tickets

5) To apply for and execute arrest warrants

6) To apply for and execute search warrants

7) To receive and return lost property

The jurisdiction of SUNY officers is limited to the campus and adjoining roadways. For this discussion, it is important to note that there are two categories of law enforcement officers in New York state. A "peace officer" is a person who is given law enforcement powers which are narrowly defined to his or her special duties. A "police officer" has a greater scope of law enforcement powers related to the political entity who appointed the officer. Certain categories of officers have statewide powers, such as state and environmental conservation police. In comparison to the 64 peace officer titles in the "Criminal Procedure Law," SUNY peace officers have virtually all the powers of a police officer while performing duties on campus.

Background of State University Law Enforcement

Until the late 1960s, university law enforcement consisted of campus security departments that worked with local police departments to deal with criminal matters. The main mission of these departments was to provide general security services and enforce parking regulations. Criminal investigations and responses were handled in conjunction with local and state police departments. As will be discussed, some officers had peace officer rank as special policemen with peace officer status. The university prohibited these security officers from bearing firearms. The chief of security generally reported to the director of the physical plant.

In 1968, the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Crime requested that a study be undertaken to review campus security operations on State University of New York campuses. The study was prompted by the growth of the university, rising crime rates, and frequent outside police response to deal with campus protests related to the

Vietnam war, civil rights, and campus governance.

The study presented the following main points:

1) The university has a responsibility to supervise its own affairs, cooperating in appropriate ways with law enforcement agencies, but not depending upon them initially or exclusively for the maintenance of peace and order on the campus.

2) Law enforcement on campus, under university control, must be professional and supportive of the educational mission.

3) The university must protect itself from lawbreakers and never knowingly provide sanctuary for clearly illegal activities.

At the same time, based on this report, the Board of Trustees endorsed a resolution entitled "Proposal for University Security." The report recommended the creation of a central office for security to function in a coordinating role. Each president was given the responsibility for, and authority over, the security program through an appropriate administrative officer. Other recommendations were made about staffing, hiring, and job description standards and training.

During the 1970s, the following recommendations were completed under the coordination of University-wide Director of Security, Platt Harris:

1) The establishment of civil service titles and job descriptions for officers and supervisors which outlined the duties and mission of campus security personnel. Additionally, job descriptions were also designed for directors and assistant directors, who were designated management confidential.

2) The creation of hiring procedures for classified job titles included a civil service test, physical requirements and medical requirements. It was at this time that an educational requirement of 60 credit hours was established for all new employees under the rationale that educated officers would be better prepared to serve in an

educational environment, and have better communication and analytical skills.

3) Under the authority of the education law, creation of a procedure for appointing peace officers. Officers were given peace officer powers which include serving warrants and making arrests based on probable cause. Training requirements were also established.

4) The issuance of guidelines that dealt with equipment, uniforms, and operating procedures.

During 1975, a task force was created to define the role of campus security officers. By this time, the total responsibility of security departments included environmental safety, security, and traffic and parking enforcement. Based on these deliberations, a recommendation was made to study "the public safety model" and create a structure that was flexible enough to meet campus operating needs. The term "public safety" was used to embody all the responsibilities performed by security departments. The 1975 task force also recommended that officers be listed in the "Criminal Procedure Law" as peace officers, to legally define their law enforcement powers. In 1977, the Board of Trustees endorsed the public safety model as an appropriate mechanism for campus departments. This model was later reaffirmed in 1985 by the University in response to requests by certain campuses, and the collective bargaining units, to change the nomenclature from public safety to University police.

In 1986, the first training academy sponsored by the University was held at the State Police Academy, Albany, New York, to provide a systematic method of training new recruits. Until that date, new officers were trained at local police academies or specially sponsored training classes. Since 1986, there have been 15 sessions of basic training and courses in supervision, instructor development, and special topics under University auspices.

Legal Authority

The historical development of legal authority for peace officers is complex. In 1969, the

Education Law amended the powers of the Board of Trustees to include the power "to appoint from time to time, special policemen who shall be peace officers." The actual powers of special policemen were never enumerated. In 1972 an amendment to the Education Law eliminated the title of special policemen and substituted two categories: security officers and peace officers. Peace officers had the powers of all police officers while security officers had no law enforcement powers. This resulted in much confusion as to the legal status of officers and, at times, the non-recognition of the law enforcement authority of SUNY by certain courts and citizens.

In 1980, the Omnibus Peace Officers Bill was signed into law to clarify the legal definition of all peace officer titles in the state of New York. The law also stipulated that training for all officers must be completed within six months after appointment as a peace officer. The powers that officers currently have were enumerated in the Education law and were included in the Criminal Procedure Law.

The 1980 statute also defined the jurisdiction of officers as the campus and adjoining roadways. Until this time, the jurisdiction of officers was limited by the Education Law to the buildings and grounds of such institution and to the extent of one mile beyond such groups. This created a new set of operational problems in that SUNY peace officers assisting local police and conducting off-campus University-related duties did so without peace officer status.

An opinion by the attorney general in 1991 further endorsed this view of limited jurisdiction after the University inquired as to whether public safety officers retained peace officer status while traveling between campus properties owned by the University. The attorney general concluded that law enforcement powers for SUNY officers may only be exercised on the campus and adjoining highways. With few exceptions, peace officer powers are restricted to the geographical boundaries described in the Education Law.

1992 Task Force on Public Safety

A third task force was created in 1991 under the auspices of the Vice Chancellor for

Student Affairs and Special Programs, to study the operational problems related to limited jurisdiction, and to reexamine the role of campus officers.

After an extensive study, this group recommended the following:

1) The jurisdiction of SUNY officers should be expanded to include jurisdiction while the officer is on duty. This would allow for follow-up investigations off campus for on-campus incidents, assisting community police agencies, and conducting University business such as bank and safety escorts.

2) The designation of SUNY officers should be changed to "University police" to improve the sense of professional identity of officers and clarify their responsibilities for law enforcement within the campus community. However, University police officers would remain as peace officers in the criminal procedure law.

3) Officers should be given additional powers to execute bench warrants and to temporarily stop a person whom the officers suspect is committing, or about to commit, a crime, and execute pat-down of said person for a weapon.

These recommendations, adopted by the Board of Trustees, became the basis of University legislative program bills in 1993, 1994, and 1995. The Governor's Office, at first, opposed the entire package of recommendations. Eventually, although given approval by the Governor's Office for legislative action, the SUNY program was not passed because of intense opposition by the collective bargaining units for classified public safety officers and professional police associations. Simply stated, these groups felt that University police officers should be designated as police officers within the legal requirements of the criminal procedure law.

Campus Arming Programs

A controversial topic related to SUNY law enforcement is the arming of officers. In 1972, the Board of Trustees enacted Part 590 of the *New York Code of Rules and Regulations*, which authorized a campus president to arm officers. This formed the basis for an administrative policy (Item 080.1 Administrative Policies of the Board of Trustees) which allowed campus presidents to arm officers. The first arming programs occurred at the University at Albany in 1974 followed by the College at Brockport (1976).

Since this time,the topic has been debated, at one time or another, on all campuses. Those who oppose arming officers speak to the possibility of misuse and the negative impact on the educational environment. Those who support arming generally point to the need for officer protection in responding to serious incidents. To assist in these discussions, the Office of University Public Safety in 1991 issued discussion guidelines for campuses addressing the issue. The guidelines speak to the several review questions that include the rate of crime, emergency response to serious incidents, officer safety, and other local factors. At this time, the following campuses have arming programs whereby officers are armed as a matter of practice or arming takes place at designated times or only with certain officers: Albany, Buffalo, Stony Brook, College at Buffalo, Brockport, New Paltz, Oswego, Plattsburgh, Purchase, Canton, Cobleskill, Delhi, Morrisville, and Utica/Rome.

University Police Proposal

In 1995, the Office of University Public Safety prepared a proposal that would create the title of University police officer in the Criminal Procedure Law. This would extend jurisdiction and give additional powers of "stop and frisk" and execution of bench warrants. Although officers would have statewide powers for making criminal arrests for felonies and misdemeanors, their geographical area of employment would be limited to the appointing campus. As with city, town, and village officers, this limits such powers as issuing uniform traffic tickets and making arrests for violations to the geographical boundaries of the campus where the officer is employed. Arrest and search warrant powers would be limited to the county where the campus is located. The appointment of university police officers remains with the campus president. A majority of campuses support this initiative and a legislative program effort is planned for spring 1997.

Community College Law Enforcement Operations

The majority of community college campuses provide security and safety services through college campus security departments and contract security guard agencies. Some campuses have a mix of college employees and contract guards, or augment their staffs with off-duty police officers. These personnel deliver a wide variety of campus security services under the "security model" of campus law enforcement. In this model, security officers perform watch-and-guard services but have no law enforcement powers. Criminal apprehensions and investigations are turned over to the local police and state police.

As security guard agencies, community college campuses must comply with the Security Guard Act of 1995, which requires a series of training courses for security officers and licensing by the Department of State. To date, all campuses are in compliance with this statute.

During the deliberations of the 1992 Task Force on Public Safety, the issue of law enforcement services for community college campuses was reviewed with campus administrators as to staffing, the need for additional law enforcement powers, and continuing issues and concerns. The vast majority of campuses were satisfied with the current level of services. At that time, two campuses—Herkimer and Mohawk Valley Community Colleges—expressed an interest in having limited peace officer powers for the director and supervisory personnel. In 1995, these campuses pursued local legislative initiatives to amend the criminal procedure law and grant peace officer powers for supervisory personnel. A University-wide program bill for limited peace officer powers for community college security personnel will again be reviewed for the next legislative session.

Rethinking SUNY

In view of the history of SUNY law enforcement and current university debate related to rethinking SUNY, what are some future courses of action for university law enforcement operations?

From the perspective of the System Administration Office of Student Affairs and University Public Safety and the SUNY Directors Association, the following items are viewed as potential operational objectives and trends:

1) SUNY peace officers should be designated as University police officers. As recommended by the 1992 Task Force and discussed in the University police proposal, jurisdiction of departments must be expanded in order to provide full law enforcement services to the campus community. Police status will legally expand services that are needed for law enforcement operations within parameters set by the campus president.

2) Statewide training efforts must be increased for current personnel. There is a need for system-wide training to update current personnel on various timely topics such as use of force, domestic violence, and dealing with diverse campus populations.

3) Civil service rules and University practices should be changed to allow officers to be redeployed at other campuses for both short-term and long-term assignments. At this time, officers may be assigned to other campuses on a voluntary basis.

4) Merging departments in close geographical proximity to one another is an option that deserves close review. Currently, each department has its own budget and administrative structure, and potential savings are possible.

5) Local initiatives must be explored to provide support and assistance among campuses in regional areas, such as training, equipment sharing, and redeployment of personnel.

III. Findings of the Subcommittees

Education
Hal Payne, Chair

Prevention & Compliance
Chris Strong, Chair

Crisis Management
John Coffey, Chair

A. Education Subcommittee

The Education Subcommittee of the University-wide Task Force on Campus Safety was charged with evaluating educational programs relevant to safety issues which exist both internal and external to SUNY. The subcommittee was asked to "…investigate programs that educate all members of the campus community to maximize their safety as well as others on campus." Programs and policies which were identified as having been successfully implemented on certain SUNY campuses were to be catalogued in this report as a resource of model programs to be shared with other SUNY campuses. At the conclusion of the study, the subcommittee could, if necessary, recommend changes in the University policies and procedures.

The subcommittee began its work by identifying areas related to personal safety in which educational initiatives would be an appropriate response. The areas were 1) sexual assault; 2) sexual harassment; 3) physical assault, harassment, and aggravated assault; 4) alcohol and other substance abuse; and 5) hate speech, bias-related violence, and asocial behavior. Members then reviewed information submitted by individual campuses in response to the request of the chair of the Task Force. This review attempted to identify "ideal" or model programs currently in place on SUNY campuses that address the topical areas selected by the subcommittee. Subcommittee members also utilized additional resources such as publications, manuals, electronic bulletin boards to identify programs to be included in the report. *Of particular interest in this review were the goals of the specific educational initiative and impact of that effort on increasing knowledge and changing behavior.*

The subcommittee is submitting its findings in the five specific areas cited above. The discussion will detail means used by institutions to identify issues and problem areas, and the process through which institutions set goals related to these concerns. We also clarify whether programs seek to achieve educational goals or behavior modification goals, and discuss the various approaches to program initiatives, assessment and evaluation.

Area 1)

Educational Programs Addressing Sexual Assault

An outstanding resource for campuses on the topic of sexual assault is the campus crime prevention publication, *RAPE...Awareness, Education, Prevention and Response—A Practical Guide for College and University Administrators* (1992). It presents information on awareness, education, prevention, and post-intervention response, including background, suggested strategies, target populations, and audiences, programs, and services.

As this report states, "rape and sexual aggression are among the more serious issues faced on college and university campuses. At a point when reported rape cases are at an all-time high, rape is the most prevalent violent crime that occurs on campus" (p. 1). Though reporting of sexual assaults has increased, there is also widespread recognition of the fact that a substantial number of these incidents go unreported.

The extent to which individual campuses are aware of the problem is dependent on a wide range of factors, including the perceived climate of support for survivors, the extent to which information on incidents is shared and/or managed, and the actual level of such incidents. National data indicates that 15% to 29% of college women have been raped, and another 20% to 29% have been victims of attempted rape (*Rape...A Practical Guide*, p. 2). Individual campuses can substantiate the relevance of these findings through review of campus law enforcement and disciplinary records, discussions with counseling center and residence hall staff, and through such additional resources as women's groups and campus safety committees, among others.

Education is an appropriate and potentially powerful response to the problem of rape in the campus context. "Most rapes involving college students (as assailant or the victim) occur because of a lack of knowledge on the laws of rape, as a result of poor communication, because of the use of alcohol or other chemical substances, and because of the belief by many men and women in "rape myths" (Keller, 1992, p. 50). Therefore, the mutually supportive objectives of increasing knowledge and changing behavior can both be served through educational interventions.

Peer education is a particularly valuable resource for education in the area of sexual assault. Campuses have utilized peer education in a variety of approaches to convey critical messages in new-student orientation and in classrooms, for residents and commuters, for Greek letter organizations and student athletes, and for international students. Program approaches are typically peer-facilitated discussions, with some including dramatic presentations.

Since peer group influence can be a significant determinant in encouraging men to subscribe to rape myths or in reinforcing views of women as sexualized objects, peers can also be a powerful factor to counter these influences. This point is emphasized by Berkowitz, Burkhart, and Bourg in their article, "Research on College Men and Rape":

> Peer-facilitated groups that use respected campus student leaders as role models may be particularly effective in generating positive peer pressure against rape and in modeling alternatives to traditional male sexist behavior. All-male, peer-facilitated workshop formats can also encourage men who do not adhere to rape-supportive beliefs and attitudes to speak out and have their views represented among the diversity of male viewpoints. (Berkowitz, 1994, p. 15)

Effective peer education addressing sexual assault requires a substantial investment of time and energy by competent and well trained professionals. No program which addresses such an emotionally laden issue can be initiated without comprehensive planning for careful selection, training, and supervision of participants.

Of similar value to the use of peers in conveying messages about sexual assault is the reliance on featured or guest speakers to attract the attention and participation of the target audience. Speakers who have experience in offering this type of program will likely have established a title for their presentations which attracts an audience and conveys an appropriate message about its content. Each community will have its unique resources which serve this purpose, identifiable through either such campus sources as the women's studies department, women's center, the affirmative action office, or through such local sources as victims' support groups or hot lines. In addition, individuals with regional or national name recognition are available through agents or speakers bureaus.

Passive forms of communication such as brochures, posters, and electronic media can also serve as powerful educational tools. A wide variety of prepared materials and resources are available, or the campus may choose to create its own, utilizing student creativity and tapping into local culture and concerns. Media campaigns targeting the topic of sexual assault can be incorporated into credit-bearing structures, including courses or independent study and internships. Any such initiative should incorporate a statement of policy, endorsed at the highest levels of campus administration, which clearly indicates that sexual assault and related behaviors are unacceptable.

A hotline that affords the opportunity to report incidents, identify available resources, and receive an empathic response to victims of sexual assault is a highly desirable alternative for any campus. Implementing a hotline requires careful planning to address such needs as appropriate identification, training, and support for staff; physical and fiscal resources required; and how the hotline is identified and its availability publicized. It may be advisable to integrate the topic of sexual assault along with other crisis response areas into an existing or planned hotline mechanism.

All campus initiatives to address the issue of sexual assault should be coordinated through a mechanism appropriate to the campus culture. This may mean creating a broadly representative sexual assault prevention committee, which includes membership from constituencies concerned with and affected by sexual assault. Consideration should be given to such areas as women's affairs and/or sexual assault crisis resources;

campus law enforcement; judicial affairs; and traditional student affairs divisions, among others. Such a committee can serve as a vital connection between areas which respond to the needs of survivors of sexual assault, for the purpose of coordinating resources, monitoring the magnitude of the problem, tracking incidents, and working collectively on educational initiatives.

Sexual assault exists as a problem on virtually every campus. That it is recognized as such and addressed openly will accomplish much in changing the dimensions of myth and culture which perpetuate the problem. Aggressive educational efforts which help to establish a climate of respect for the integrity and well-being of those who are the victims of sexual assault is the responsibility of every campus.

Area 2)
Sexual Harassment

What is sexual harassment?
(Definition from N.O.W. and the Working Women's Institute)

Sexual Harassment is an unwanted verbal or physical sexual advance or sexually explicit derogatory statements made by someone in the classroom or workplace, which are offensive, or which cause the recipient discomfort or humiliation, or which interfere with the recipient's education or job performance. It can include:

1) Leering at a person's body;

2) Verbal harassment or abuse of a sexual nature;

3) Unnecessary touching, patting, pinching, or constant brushing against a person's body;

4) Subtle pressure for sexual favors;

5) Demanding sexual favors accompanied by implied or overt threats concerning one's

grades, recommendations, job, performance evaluation, promotion, etc.;

6) Physical assault.

Sexual Harassment and the Law

Sexual harassment is a violation of section 703 of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In November of 1980, the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) issued guidelines defining sexual harassment as a form of sex discrimination.

Each SUNY campus is responsible for having a sexual harassment policy prohibiting such behavior. Although the law was originally written to apply to sexual harassment in the workplace, consistent with SUNY's policy to ensure fair treatment to all individuals, protection for students is to be provided under these same guidelines.

Employees and students alleging harassment may use the "SUNY Discrimination Grievance Procedure" for review of their allegation (State University of New York Affirmative Action Digest, 1995).

A review of the materials submitted from the campuses for our Safety Task Force and the annual personal safety reports submitted from each campus, revealed very little in the way of educational programs relating to sexual harassment. It was occasionally mentioned in context with other programs being offered. Personal discussions with several campuses indicated that the staff, and sometimes the faculty, have formal sexual harassment training, but this training is not extended to students.

Sexual harassment was, however, covered in the student handbooks, pamphlets, posters, and briefly at most orientations. The written material included definitions, whom to contact, and what to do. This information is available from several resources. Discussion with several campuses revealed that sexual harassment, as a topic unto itself, was lost to the more pressing issues of sexual assault, date rape, hate crimes, and alcohol and drug abuse. Several student handbooks (Broome Community College) covered sexual harassment in great detail, giving examples, options for preventing and options for handling.

At least one campus (Stony Brook) mandates sexual harassment training for their graduate-level students. They do not require training for their undergraduates. The mandated training for their graduate students is based on the premise that they have a closer working relationship with faculty and mentors. Their programs, research, etc., are often at the discretion of these advisors, leaving them more vulnerable. The program was instituted to protect the University from lawsuits and liability issues.

SUNY Albany has a "train the trainer" program which, each year, trains approximately 75 individuals (some continue for several years) from various areas on campus (residence halls, faculty, staff). The names of these individuals are posted and made available throughout the campus for faculty, staff, or students to contact if they feel they need information or assistance on sexual harassment.

Buffalo State College recently initiated a series of workshops for senior officers, deans, department chairs, and staff in the areas of sexual harassment, disabled discrimination, and affirmative action. These workshops, conducted by faculty at the University at Buffalo Law School, were mandated for senior officers and deans, strongly recommended for department chairs, and offered to professional staff on a voluntary basis with the urging of the President. Some support for these workshops was provided by SUNY Systems Administration. The workshops for professional staff are offered as a part of the College's Annual Professional Development Institute under the theme, "Coping with the Changing Roles of Leaders." One innovative session during the Institute approaches sexual harassment and other bias-related issues through an interactive theater presentation featuring actors from the Buffalo, N.Y.-based *Theater for Change*. This company performs short scenes illustrating some of the issues, including sexual harassment, that arise as diverse groups of people come together in the workplace. Following the scenes, workshop participants have an opportunity to question the characters and to participate in lively discussions about workplace issues, led by faculty from the Cornell University New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations.

On most campuses, peer counselors, advisors, and residence hall personnel are trained in a myriad of subjects, including sexual harassment. Some campuses offer courses in their women's studies departments with sexual harassment as a component. Others may invite an individual from the affirmative action office to speak to a class regarding sexual harassment. Unfortunately this only reaches the individuals who take the course.

It was not possible to measure the success of any programs based on before-and-after documentation. Also, due to the highly confidential nature of the subject, it is not possible to evaluate, as there is no requirement to post "numbers" of reported cases each year.

We believe there need to be more educational and training programs on campuses regarding sexual harassment, not only for the purpose of promoting respect among individuals, but to prepare students for a "world of work" where this issue will continue to exist. As an educational institution, the University has an obligation not only to teach students academic subject matter, but also how to legally and effectively handle their next phase of life. If the "formally educated" are not literate about what constitutes sexual harassment and its effects in general, we may have failed as educators.

The University-wide Affirmative Action Office at Systems Administration has sexual harassment video training tapes, and there is also information on the Internet regarding sexual harassment cases and training opportunities.

Area 3)

Educational Safety Programs/Initiatives Regarding Physical Assault, Harassment, and Aggravated Assault

Common Initiatives

While each college or university has safety concerns that are specific to its own climate, many campuses are employing similar educational tools in addressing these issues as they arise.

In identifying particular issues as problems, many campuses have used public safety reports and complaints filed by groups or individuals with regards to safety issues. In addition to this, several administrations have gone off campus to investigate local police agency reports. Although flat observation can sometimes be misleading, some campuses have found it helpful to more purposefully observe trends in student interaction in identifying potential problems. Further still, it has been found that some campuses have used national trends as derived from reports of incidents across the country in shaping the direction of their campus initiatives. While these efforts continue, most colleges and universities are encouraging the development of committees specifically charged with the task of identifying and discussing safety concerns and solutions.

There are several educational strategies that are common to nearly all colleges and universities. They include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Publication and dissemination of personal safety policy, procedures, and tips

- Media campaigns using posters, banners, newsletters, campus publications, etc.

- Safety and self-defense workshops, classes, theme weeks, programs and presentations

- Target-group programming, such as anti-hazing seminars for Greeks and runner safety tip seminars for runners

- New student and employee orientation sessions

Most of these programs are aimed at increasing the awareness of unsafe behaviors and decreasing individuals' risk of placing themselves in a vulnerable situation. At the same time, they accomplish the task of making individuals aware of their personal rights and the resources/services available to them in exercising those rights.

Assessing the impact of such programs can be difficult. The number of reported incidents may rise as individuals become aware of what constitutes a violation of personal rights. Where possible, campuses have monitored incidents in which new students or employees are involved. Where workshops and presentations are concerned, participants are often asked to evaluate the event as a part of program closure. On those campuses where committees are in place, these groups have served as the reviewing body charged with monitoring overall campus efforts and successes.

Campus-specific Initiatives

At SUNY Binghamton, safety issues are discussed every Monday morning as part of the "Monday Morning Work Group" sessions. This group meets weekly to review all of the safety incidents that have occurred within that week and sets goals in accordance with issues that arise.

SUNY Oneonta, in addressing parking safety concerns, has developed presentations designed to educate drivers on campus parking safety and tips on what to do in vulnerable situations.

SUNY Albany, in responding to domestic/relationship violence concerns, has developed the "Clothesline Project," an awareness program designed to increase overall knowledge about relationship violence, and resources and services available to those struggling with this issue.

The Institute of Technology at Rome has developed general training programs designed to modify behavior and reduce the risk of employees becoming victims of physical assault or harassment.

Area 4)
Educational Programs Addressing Alcohol and Other Substance Abuse

While alcohol and other substance abuse is a commonly used phrase, there is some discussion among health administrators as to whether or not the term "abuse" is warranted, since most of the substances are illegal and the health benefits of any use are questionable at best. Issues related to alcohol and other substance abuse are common to all campuses. Many first-year students are experiencing alcohol and other substances for the very first time and will initiate, in college, use patterns that they will carry with them for the rest of their lives. This becomes critical in light of the factors that influence their choices about use; i.e., separation from their home and normal lifestyle, heightened levels of stress, easy access to alcohol and drugs, peer pressure, and campus culture.

Students who are under the influence of alcohol or other substances are more likely to be involved in violent behavior, vandalism, noise violations, and other student annoyances as well as negative encounters with residence hall staff. We also know that students are less able to make competent decisions with regards to their limits when under the influence of these substances, especially where driving and sexual activities are concerned. These problems are often further compounded with students who have had limited experience. In light of the potential threat that this situation clearly represents, it becomes imperative that campuses grapple successfully with this issue.

At Buffalo State College, under a FIPSE Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Prevention Program development grant funded from 1992–95, two campus surveys were conducted which clarified the alcohol and other substance abuse trends and patterns within the student population. The results of the survey demonstrated the role that alcohol and other substance use played in the culture of the College and clearly identified this as a problem for the campus overall. In response, specific programs and activities were designed to accomplish several critical goals. These goals are listed below, together with three of the initiatives that were used to accomplish each goal.

Goal 1)
To establish ongoing institutional support and commitment for FIPSE initiatives after grant funds leave the campus

- College Health Center to carry out Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) abuse prevention programming when grant funding ends

- AOD coordinator position was established within the college

- AOD steering committee to oversee campus-wide efforts

Goal 2)
To develop risk reduction services for the general student population

- Educational programs for new students and parents at orientation and in class
- On-Campus Talks About Alcohol (OCTAA) programming initiated
- Campus policy on use of alcohol and other drugs distributed

Goal 3)
To develop high- risk prevention services for targeted populations of students

- Awareness and prevention programs designed specifically for Greeks and athletes
- Residence hall staff trained and required to conduct programs designed for hall residents
- Adult children of alcoholics group formed

Goal 4)
To develop and foster campus norms which reduce alcohol and other substance abuse

- Campus-wide message strategies campaign initiated; i.e., posters, banners, stickers
- All campus coffee houses and other alcohol-free social programs initiated
- Sober Summer Celebration initiated

Goal 5)
To develop screening and referral services for students demonstrating a need for treatment

- Screening and referral training for residence life, student life, and public safety

- Collaboration with and presentations by off-campus community agencies

- In-service training for all faculty and professional staff

Goal 6)
To evaluate the impact of all alcohol and other substance abuse prevention and reduction programs and services

- AOD steering committee to evaluate all AOD programs and activities

- Continued surveying of campus to assess changes in student behavior and attitude

- All workshops and presentations conclude with participant evaluations

In all, these goals were designed to accomplish the two-fold task of increasing the overall student knowledge about the dangers of alcohol and other substance abuse while, at the same time, changing behaviors and attitudes with regard to use in general.

Of particular note are the programs dealing with targeted populations, as they tend to have the greatest potential with regard to changing student norms and behaviors. For example, programs have been designed to use football players to educate football players, and members of Greek letter organizations to educate other Greeks. Reports indicate that these programs have been well received and that expansions are already under way.

Central to the Buffalo State College programs, and several others being initiated in SUNY and nationally, is the premise that education about substance abuse trends and patterns within the student population will influence subsequent patterns of usage. A peer education program strives to provide students with accurate information about drinking and substance abuse on campus in order to alleviate the pressures to drink or abuse drugs…"because everyone else is doing it." Results of this project at Buffalo State are inconclusive; however, results at other SUNY schools and nationally show a downward trend.

The initiatives that were started under the FIPSE grant at Buffalo State College are not unique to this campus. SUNY colleges and universities are dealing with these issues in similar ways. While many programs may not be as ambitious, they address the issues as they relate to the particular campus needs. The College at Oneonta, in addition to presenting programs on alcohol and drug awareness and prevention, also have ongoing presentations on DWI and Breathalyzers. The College of Technology at Alfred, in dealing with several deaths as a result of automobile accidents, has initiated staff development programs for office coordinators provided by its Health Department. That campus also established general driving safety programs to inform students about proper automobile operations, safety tips, and the dangers of driving while under the influence of any substances. Alfred's Department of Public Safety is now conducting safety programs with residence hall staff to heighten their awareness in dealing with on-campus students.

Even with all of the current efforts that are being put forward by various campuses, more aggressive steps must be taken to ensure the personal safety of students. Alcohol and other substance use and abuse is common practice at nearly all colleges and universities and its treatment must become an institutional priority.

Area 5
Hate Speech, Bias-Related Violence, and Asocial Behavior

The University recognizes the value of cultural diversity as a source of strength as well as for the richness it offers both educational and life experiences. If the University is to meet the challenges required of the global era, it must learn to address, understand, and appreciate cultural differences through actual experience.

A strong commitment to diversity introduces a variety of minority cultures and beliefs, all of which compete, in varying degrees, for recognition and preservation within the dominant culture. Efforts to channel that competition into multicultural understanding can serve as a key contributor towards avoiding any potential polarization of issues which might lead to oppression or prejudice against target groups.

In recent decades, significant effort has been made to protect the rights of all minority groups, yet violence motivated by racial, religious, and ethnic hatred continue to persist in certain quarters. Often these crimes are mistakenly reported as assaults or vandalism without indication that they were, in fact, sparked by some form of prejudice, bigotry, or hatred.

It is the policy of the University to challenge prejudice and bigotry through the implementation of educational programs designed to foster multicultural understandings and build trust between all groups of the campus community.

It is the policy of the University to sensitize the campus community to the harmful effects of institutional discrimination, through an ongoing discussion of issues and events, and to avoid, where possible, the harm to individuals and groups that arises out of ignorance, misinformation, and prejudice in the community.

In addition to the primary goal of deterring hate crimes, the University is committed to establishing appropriate responses to issues of prejudice, bigotry, and discrimination as they are identified. This response shall include the use of legal services as warranted. Any acts or threats of violence, property damage, harassment, intimidation, or other crimes designed to infringe on the rights of individuals or groups, will be given the highest priority for an immediate and satisfactory resolution of the issue.

Lastly, it is the policy of the University to view hate crimes not only as crimes against a targeted victim, but as crimes against the community, taking into account the victim's racial, religious, ethnic, or sexual orientation group as a whole.

Crimes of Hatred Program Recommendations

Prevention of Incidents

- Develop campus-based teaching and training methodologies to sensitize the campus community to the consequences of all forms of discrimination, and to use these methodologies in such a manner as to offset routine student and staff turnover

- Establish a liaison between and among all known campus groups for the purposes of building open communication and trust

Response to Incidents

- Develop appropriate intervention strategies in dealing with the issue of hatred and bigotry as they become known

- Provide a team of trained interveners to meet with identified groups to allay fears, foster the University's commitment to diversity, reduce potential for counter violence and provide direct and referral assistance to the victim and the victim's family and/or group

- Conduct open forums for the purposes of relating specific incidents of breaches of campus safety to issues concerning campus safety in general

Reporting the Incidents

As part of the University's investigative and reporting procedures, it is the policy of the University:

- To evaluate the commission of all unlawful acts against any victim or group in order to determine if the act may be the result of bigotry or prejudice

- To capture historical information relevant to crimes of hatred for the purpose of developing new strategies of prevention and response

Definitions

Hate Crime	Any unlawful action designed to frighten, harm, injure, intimidate or harass an individual, in whole or in part because of a bias

	motivation against the actual or perceived race, religion, ethnic background, or sexual orientation of the targeted victim or group
Prejudice	An unreasonable and unjustifiable negative attitude toward a group and its individuals. Prejudice involves prejudgment. It biases one against an individual or group based solely on membership in a particular group
Race	A group of persons who possess common physical characteristics genetically transmitted by descent and heredity that distinguishes them as a distinct division of humankind
Ethnic Group	A group of persons of the same national origin who share common or similar traits, languages, and traditions
Religious Group	Persons who share the same religious beliefs regarding the origin and purpose of the universe and the existence or nonexistence of a supreme being
Sexual Orientation	As sexual attraction toward, and responsiveness to, members of one's own sex or members of the opposite sex

Without question, the residence hall experience on most campuses lies at the center of the University policy which considers student experience with, and acceptance of, diversity. Limiting such policies to a campus resident perspective may overlook the need to include the nonresident commuter population when dealing with issues of prejudice and bigotry.

Community colleges, for instance, enroll large numbers of students who may congregate in living quarters which are not under the supervision of the college. Instances of prejudice, bigotry, and harassment may go undetected for unreasonable amounts of time, and it is that length of time which may seriously aggravate the degree of actual violence.

Complicating this circumstance are the issues of liability which may arise where a college becomes directly involved in affairs which are outside of its jurisdiction.

Recommendations

Overall Recommendations

The University supports a policy which recognizes a need to extend its responsibility beyond campus boundaries in order to address the safety and well being of all its students.

The University encourages campuses with commuter populations to establish a communication link with representatives of that population and to jointly implement programs designed to address the needs and concerns of the off-campus student population.

When a significant number of off-campus students tend to reside at a common housing complex, colleges should:

1) Encourage landlords to establish appropriate levels of supervision

2) Implement an appropriate system of joint communication as a first response in dealing with issues of discrimination and prejudice as they begin to appear

Recommendations Related to Sexual Assault Prevention

1) Use peer education to convey messages related to preventing sexual assault. Planning for selection, training, and supervision of peer educators is critical

2) Use keynote speakers to attract a target audience and convey appropriate messages

3) Use brochures, posters, and electronic media as supplemental educational tools

4) Provide a "hotline" service for reporting of incidents of assault

5) Coordinate efforts through an organizational structure appropriate to the campus, such as a coordinating committee, task force, or other body

Recommendations Related to Preventing Sexual Harassment

1) Increase the number of educational and training programs which specifically focus on sexual harassment

2) Utilize the SUNY University-wide Affirmative Action Office at Systems Administration as a resource for training materials and information

3) Provide training related to sexual harassment for students as well as for faculty and staff

4) Consider instituting a "training of the trainers" program, to include faculty, staff, and students who would serve as resources for information and assistance

5) Use special performance theater groups, such as the Buffalo-based *Theater for Change*, and other media to enhance the quality of training

Recommendations Related to Physical Assault, Harassment, and Aggravated Assault

1) Publish and disseminate information related to campus safety policies and procedures, as well as suggestions for increasing personal safety

2) Conduct media campaigns using posters, banners, newsletters, and campus publications

3) Conduct safety and self-defense workshops for students, faculty, and staff

4) Target safety programs for specific groups, such as anti-hazing seminars for Greek organizations or runner safety seminars for joggers

5) Establish review committees to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of training workshops

6) Establish a safety review team to evaluate breaches of campus safety, and recommend action, as appropriate

Recommendations Related to Alcohol and Other Substance Abuse

1) Establish a campus alcohol and other drug prevention program to be guided by a steering committee having authority to address matters of policy and practice

2) Conduct educational programs related to alcohol and other substance abuse prevention. Use trained peer-educators whenever possible

3) Target campus programming toward high-risk groups, such as Greek organizations, athletes, and resident students

4) Foster norms and values on campus that minimize reliance on alcohol and drugs for socializing among students, faculty, and staff

5) Provide screening and referral services for students in need of treatment for alcohol or drug abuse

6) Provide training workshops on drinking and driving

Recommendations Related to Hate Speech, Bias-Related Violence and Asocial Behavior

1) Campuses should assert a strong commitment to diversity and multicultural understanding

2) Develop campus-based teaching and training methods to sensitize the campus community to the consequences of discrimination, hate speech, and bias-related violence

3) Provide a team of trained intervention specialists to meet with targeted groups whenever incidents occur

4) Conduct open forums to foster communication following specific incidents of hate speech or bias-related violence

5) Target workshops on issues of prejudice and bigotry for non-resident commuting students

B. Prevention & Compliance Subcommittee

With an eye toward the formation of a comprehensive crime prevention model, the Subcommittee on Prevention and Compliance examined state and federal mandates regarding campus crime, individual campus models of preventative programming, and protocols for responding in times of potential harm or crisis. The committee was charged to review disciplinary codes, systems for gathering and distributing crime statistics, and methods for reporting all crime, but especially sexual- and bias- related crime. Areas of consideration included training of personnel, security of buildings and grounds, and campus climate as it relates to crime and crime prevention.

> There is no reason to believe that college campuses will not be wholly reflective of the society that hosts them. We may expect that our students, faculty and staff represent a diverse cross section of contemporary life, and it is unreasonable for us to believe that human nature changes when people cross the "Maginot Line" of the campus boundary. Because violence can and does occur, we must work to prevent it and act decisively in response to it. Our goals must be to show no tolerance for it, to plan for it in our judicial and student behavior codes, and to involve our entire campus in security and prevention. (Sherrill, 1989)

As we gathered information, data, and opinion, it became clear that the institutions which best address crime prevention are those where the responsibility for safety is shared by many constituencies rather than assigned to one or two departments. In these successful communities, students, faculty, and staff collaborate in addressing issues of safety and are aware of the mechanisms in place for reporting crime, violations of college policy, and circumstances that generate fear. Responsibility for compliance with federal and state mandates is shared within the campus community. Members of the community are queried as to the threats, perceived or tangible, to their well being, and are encouraged to participate in preventative and responsive initiatives designed to address those issues. Individual members of the community understand that they are responsible for their own well-being, and are encouraged to behave in ways that enhance the safety of the community for others as well.

Information compiled for use in this report was gathered in a variety of ways. Senior student affairs officers were asked to respond to a survey regarding campus safety early in the academic year. This subcommittee found rich information in the responses to the requests for prevention programs offered on campuses related to personal safety, for procedures and policies used to ensure compliance with rules and laws affecting the community, and for protocols used for the periodic review of safety issues. Each campus was requested to provide the subcommittee with copies of disciplinary codes, student handbooks, crisis protocols, and summaries of programs focused on crime prevention. One member of the subcommittee talked to members of personal safety committees on a variety of campuses, and queried them as to the purpose of the committee, its activities, and outcomes. Finally, current literature was reviewed in the areas of legislative requirements, campus crime prevention, and campus violence.

All of the institutions that responded to our surveys were involved in some kind of crime prevention. Consistent from campus to campus was a commitment to training employees in a variety of areas related to personal safety. Training programs cover topics such as diversity- and bias-related incidents, conflict resolution and mediation, dealing with difficult people; sexual harassment and sexual assault; violence in the workplace; workplace safety; hazardous materials and blood-borne pathogens safety; and mental health emergencies. All respondents highlighted training programs provided for residence life staff and public safety departments; fewer included program for extended student affairs areas and physical plant employees. Rarely were the faculty and administrative staff included in training programs.

Several campus respondents highlighted the effectiveness of community policing in raising the comfort level of students and staff through intentional and direct personal contact with public safety or campus police officers. The focus of community policing programs is involving campus safety officers in proactive ways with students, faculty, and staff. Often, a particular officer is associated with a particular residential area, student organization, or academic department. The officer becomes involved in a wide variety of activities within his/her assigned area in an effort to build relationships with others that will allow him/her to become a resource person. It is hoped that students will develop a level of comfort and trust with the officer, as a known member of the community, that will allow for ongoing communication, not just during times of crisis or following crimes. Officers who take part in community policing programs often attend staff meetings in residence halls or faculty departments, and are regularly seen walking through the areas to which they are connected. Bike patrols are also frequently mentioned in descriptions of community policing activities.

A variety of prevention programs were submitted by campus respondents. Clearly, many of the educational programs described in an earlier chapter are preventative in nature. The initiatives discussed in this segment are ongoing activities available to members of the campus community, rather than workshops or seminars offered at a specific time and place. The services and/or resources identified below are examples of many opportunities available for members of the campus community concerned with crime prevention and personal safety. Many of these services are underutilized on campuses, perhaps an indication of students' perceived immortality. Or, as Michael Clay Smith describes in *Responding to Violence on Campus*, the "…deceptive safe appearance of many campuses, together with a conventional attitude that sees colleges as peaceful havens set apart from the 'real world' no doubt exacerbates the problems of campus crime and violence. Getting younger students, and even adult employees and visitors, to take self protection seriously is a problem everywhere." While use of personal safety resources may increase after an incident of violence or crime, use declines as time passes. This is clearly a frustration for those who work to enhance the safety of the campus community. The following list offers examples of personal safety initiatives across the state:

- Operation ID —tools provided to engrave personal possessions with identifiable markings in an effort to deter theft and to aid in the recovery of stolen items

- Escort Programs —typically, a cadre of carefully-screened student volunteers who will accompany members of the community from campus buildings to their residence halls, vehicles, academic buildings, and in some cases, to their off-campus residences or places of employment. Some campuses use vehicles, most provide escorts who walk with patrons

- Student Medical Response Teams —student corps, typically certified emergency medical technicians (EMT), who provide first-response medical care in emergency situations. Typically dispatched through public safety or University police. Few campuses have full student ambulance services

- Mediation/Conflict Resolution Programs —an initiative gaining considerable attention on many campuses, provides trained student, faculty, and staff mediators to help resolve conflict in ways other than confrontation, competition, or violence

- Shuttle Services —often provided from downtown areas to campus locations, particularly during the hours when students have been drinking and seek transportation back to the residence halls or off-campus residences

- Advocacy Networks —groups of faculty, staff, and students trained to provide support, information, and advocacy for community members who have been harassed, discriminated against, or victimized

- Safe Rooms —accommodations available on campus for students who are in jeopardy or who have been victimized, through crime or personal disaster. Oftentimes, rooms are staffed with volunteers who provide support and security

- Rumor Response Lines —either by telephone, E-mail, or home page, several institutions have used interactive technology to respond to the campus rumor mill. Facts of actual incidents are reported, and students can post questions that are responded to by knowledgeable staff in a timely manner

- Community Watch Programs —an effort to bring members of the college and local communities together to prevent crime in neighborhoods adjacent to the campus. Students, often organized by off-campus student leaders and members of Greek organizations, work with community members to patrol neighborhoods during the hours that students are likely to walk through them from downtown establishments. Other programs are focused around reporting crime or suspicious behavior. These programs have branched into social and community service aspects as well

- Student Safety Reminders —a variety of programs that give students something to carry (whistles, flashlights, key chains) as part of awareness programming regarding personal safety

Environmental and physical plant rehabilitation and modification have been at the forefront of personal safety programs during the last decade. Inspections of campus physical plants in relation to lighting, trees and shrubs, and pedestrian and vehicular traffic patterns are regularly scheduled at most campuses. Emergency call boxes and blue lights/phones are standard equipment, and campuses plan to supplement this program at regular intervals. Additional initiatives include:

- Residence Halls
  - Room doors equipped with viewing holes, solid wood doors with dead bolts
  - Exterior doors locked at least overnight; half of campuses surveyed lock exterior doors at all times
  - Key/lock systems are constantly changing; most recent innovations include exterior doors with electronic scramble pads that include a duress code feature
  - Computer monitoring of doors that alert public safety office when doors are left ajar
  - Staff monitoring doors (Resident Assistants, night hosts)
  - Regular fire drills, safety inspections
- Other facilities
  - Key/lock systems…see above
  - Burglar alarms in administrative offices, computer center/labs, and bookstores
  - Security alarms in key administrative offices
  - Closed-circuit TV monitors in building lobbies, computer labs, parking lots, library desks, business office service counters
  - Regular fire drills

Since 1984, SUNY campuses have been required to form personal safety committees, comprised of no less than 6 faculty, staff, and student members, half of which must be women. The purpose of the committee is to review security policies, especially those related to sexual assault, to review and suggest improvement in safety education programs, to assess the availability of counseling for crime victims, to review referral and response procedures for sexual assault situations, and to assess the quality of campus personal safety policies, procedures, and programs. The effectiveness and activeness of personal safety committees vary widely across the state. More active committees meet on a very regular basis, are involved in the development and implementation of programming, are recognized as the oversight body for issues of personal safety and, as such, are regularly consulted and informed. These committees are comprised of faculty, students, and staff members who share a commitment to enhancing the safety of the college campus for all who use it. Often these committees have been given a budget with which they can fund educational and preventative activities, or supplement the programming of other departments.

When the spirit of the legislation is met by personal safety committees, the impact is felt on campus. Unfortunately, there are campuses on which the personal safety committee is not an active resource. They rarely meet and are not involved in current issues facing the campus community. On other campuses, committees do meet regularly, but concern is expressed that they do not deal with issues that students identify as important. The activities of the committee are not shared readily, and members of the committee do not seek input from campus constituencies regarding their needs and concerns.

Clearly, codified policies and procedures for addressing violations of law and college standards as well as expected consequences for such violations serve as a preventative measure. Policy statements that are easily accessible, that are clear and easy to understand, and that are logically based in the philosophy and mission of the institution, provide a strong foundation for the expectations held of college community members. On most campuses, such information is found in the student and faculty handbooks. Many judicial affairs offices, residence life programs and public safety departments publish additional brochures, pamphlets, and guides that explain policies, methods of resolving violations of policies, the rights of students who are accused of violations as well as students who are victims, and potential consequences for policy violations. Opportunities to discuss this information are made available on many campuses during new student and new faculty/staff orientation sessions.

Policies and procedures that are distributed in writing on various campuses include:

- Codes of conduct
- Residence hall guidelines
- Rules for the maintenance of public order
- Guide to personal safety and crime prevention
- Key/building access statements
- Greek relationship statements
- Guidelines for reporting bias-related incidents
- Guidelines for reporting sexual offenses

Recommendations

The committee offers the following points for consideration by campuses in the continued development and implementation of policies and programs related to campus safety:

- Written information disseminated to the campus community should be written in clear, easy to understand language.

    It is important to remember that all members of the campus community should have access to campus and personal safety information. There is a tendency, particularly regarding legal and disciplinary information, to use legal terminology that may be confusing or misleading. When such terminology is necessary, it is important to offer explanations in lay terms. Within the system, there are a number of very attractive and well written pamphlets, brochures, handbooks, and codes of conduct. The key features of those that are most appealing are information that is easily found within the documents, and policies and procedures that are defined in a common sense manner.

- Several campuses are making creative use of technology in the campus safety arena.

  Home pages and Internet connections make access to policy and procedures, safety tips, outcomes of judicial actions, and criminal statistics convenient. Interactive communication regarding criminal and/or safety incidents and the subsequent rumors surrounding them have been very helpful in ensuring the distribution of factual information. Technology related to building access, monitoring facilities, and high traffic areas are becoming more popular. We recommend that campuses explore ways in which technology can complement personal/campus safety programs.

- The publication of the actions of campus judicial outcomes and public safety daily logs in a manner that does not allow for the identification of persons involved and serves as a direct and clear record of action.

  Such tangible information helps the campus community to see that inappropriate and illegal acts are confronted and that there are consequences for such behaviors.

- Codes of student conduct should include clear and understandable statements regarding proscribed conduct.

  Students, by reading the code, should be able to understand the process of bringing charges, how charges are investigated, how charges can be resolved (administrative agreement, hearings, mediation, and arbitration) and who will resolve them, what possible sanctions exist, and what rights they have, whether a victim or a student accused of a violation. We urge that special consideration be given to policies and procedures regarding acts of discrimination and sexual offense. An outline of items to be considered for inclusion in a code of conduct can be found on pages 76–79.

- Clear administrative support and direction must be provided for personal safety committees.

As noted previously, those committees with direction and purpose are often the most driving force in the development, implementation, and evaluation of policy, procedure, and programming related to campus safety issues. The appointment of faculty, staff, and students with a demonstrated concern for safety issues is paramount to the success of these committees as well. On those campuses where campus safety committees are not an active force, we encourage chief administrative officers to reconstitute committees, taking care to include representation from constituencies that can bring information of value (students, public safety personnel, judicial affairs staff, physical plant staff, concerned faculty). The charge to the group should be formalized and made specific to the particular campus environment.

- Too often programs are directed at on-campus, undergraduate students.

Personal safety initiatives must include all of the constituencies represented on our campuses—traditional and non-traditional students;on-campus, off-campus, and commuter students; all staff and faculty and guests to the campus. The involvement of representatives from the local community in personal safety programming is encouraged.

Sample Format of Code of Student Conduct

Preamble —statement of philosophy, community standards

Definitions

- appellate board
- faculty
- judicial advisor
- judicial board
- judicial system administrator
- may
- member of the university community

- organization
- shall
- student
- university
- university official
- university policy
- university premises

Judicial Authority —given by whom? for what? jurisdiction?

Proscribed Conduct

- abuse, violence, threats of violence
- acceptable use of technology
- charges and definitions
- damage
- disruption
- doors
- drugs/alcohol
- fire safety
- harassment
- hazing
- maintenance of public order
- reckless action
- reference residence hall policies, traffic policies
- sexual assault
- sexual harassment
- violation of local, state, or federal law
- weapons

Judicial Policies and Procedures

- charges
    - how charges are communicated to students accused
    - how they file them
    - rights of the accused student

  - rights of victims
  - who can bring charges

- investigation

- suspensions pending resolution
  - students' rights
  - who can impose

- judicial board hearings
  - advisors
  - concurrent criminal and campus charges
  - evidence and testimony
  - participation by student accused
  - privacy
  - procedures for hearing
  - questioning
  - record
  - role of board
  - timeliness of process
  - weight of evidence
  - witnesses

- administrative agreements
  - conditions for resolution
  - who can resolve

- mediation or dispute resolution

- process for resolution of discrimination and sexual offense charges

Sanctions

- community service work
- conditional discharge

- disciplinary probation
- disciplinary warning
- discretionary sanctions (work assignments related to offense)
- final disposition
- loss of privileges
- order of protection/restraining order
- removal from residence hall
- residence hall probation, reassignment
- residence hall, campus, or campus activities restrictions
- restitution
- student records
- suspension/expulsion
- who can impose

Appeals

- jurisdiction of the board
- on what grounds
- who can appeal

Miscellaneous

- dissemination of results
- how to change code
- statement of authority

Credit

Stoner, R., & Cerminara, K. (1990). Harnessing the "spirit of insubordination": A model student disciplinary code. Journal of College and University Law, 89

C. Crisis Management Subcommittee Findings

What systems are in place for the prompt, efficient management of both routine and extreme emergency/crisis situations? Possible areas for consideration could include: periodic review of routine safety issues, crisis/disaster/emergency protocols; *extreme* crisis management in the area of disasters, controversial speakers, campus response to media; as well as *routine* crisis management, such as incident response protocols, health and counseling protocols, lighting surveys, etc.

In addition to participating in the several meetings of the University-wide Task Force, the Crisis Management Subcommittee developed the following methodology for the review and compilation of information concerning the planning for, and management of, emergencies on campuses of the State University System:

- Review of existing campus emergency procedures/protocols
- Review of campus response to the September 1995 survey of campus safety programs
- Review of existing New York state and federal programs for emergency management including the New York State Emergency Management Office (SEMO) and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
- Review of literature relating to the management of emergencies at college and university campuses nationwide
- Compilation of suggested resources and emergency planning protocols for use by SUNY campuses in formulating and implementing individual planning efforts

The 34 state-operated and 30 community colleges comprising the State University of New York system are each unique and varied in their makeup. The size and diversity of student bodies served, urban or rural setting, age and type of facilities, and other factors significantly influence each campus. As a result, it is not practicable or desirable to develop a single emergency and crisis management strategy which is readily adaptable to every campus.

In examining this circumstance, it has been the consensus of the Crisis Management Subcommittee to articulate broad, but achievable, planning goals that each campus should attain to ensure an adequate emergency and crisis management plan, and identify resources that campuses can utilize to achieve these goals.

Recommendations

- *Planning Goals/Crisis Levels Requiring a Campus Response*
  In order to develop a reasonable plan for emergency and crisis management response, campuses should focus overall planning efforts on effective responses to five specific crisis or emergency levels:

Level 1) Crisis Intervention

Description:

An event that affects one or more persons on the campus, but is localized. Intervention is required to mitigate the crisis and minimize its effect on the larger campus community.

Examples:

An event, including accidents, affecting one or several individuals resulting in injury or life threatening situation.

Planning is necessary to insure an immediate and appropriate response to the emergency, including possible follow-up counseling to persons injured and/or survivors of the event.

Level 2) Campus-Level Emergency

Description:

A general emergency affecting most or all persons on campus. Intervention is required to minimize the impact and restore necessary services.

Examples:
A shut-down of one or more campus facilities due to utility failure;
Disruption in campus service such as dining hall;
Crowd control of major assembly (rock concert);
Weather-related emergencies that may shut down campus buildings/services.

Planning: An appropriate level of planning is required to allow expeditious restoration of services and provision of temporary facilities as needed.

Level 3) Campus/Community-level Emergency

Description:

A larger emergency affecting the campus and the locale in which the campus is located.

Examples:
A campus-wide power failure or other event requiring the temporary relocation of campus populations.

Planning at the campus level is necessary to guarantee public safety and provide necessary services. Additionally, coordination with the local community, including county, state, and federal emergency management officials is essential.

Level 4) Community/Campus-level Emergency

Description:

A disturbance within the local community that may have an impact upon the campus.

Examples:
Radiologic emergency from nuclear power plant in campus vicinity may cause evacuation of community to campus or campus to community;
Civil disturbance within the locale.

Planning required; includes familiarity with, and access to, state and county radiologic emergency plans and coordination with local, state, and federal officials, especially if the campus is called upon to provide access to the public or emergency service agencies.

Level 5) Major Emergency

Description:

A significant event affecting a larger region or the entire state.

Examples:

Major winter storms; earthquakes; major regionalized or state-wide flooding;
Serious economic or political disturbance at the state or national level.

Planning is necessary to ensure an adequate response to protect public safety and mitigate damages to campus buildings and grounds. Again, coordination with local, state, and federal emergency management officials is essential.

- *Planning Strategies for Appropriate Crisis Response*

Each state-operated campus and each community college must update existing crisis intervention and emergency management plans. Campuses without an extant plan, must create a new plan

> *Note*: The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has prepared a guide to emergency planning entitled: *Emergency Management Guide for Business and Industry* (available on the Internet at http://www.fema.gov). Using that document as a guide, the following planning and implementation steps should be followed:

Step 1) Establish a Planning Team

Form the team
Establish authority
Issue a mission statement
Establish a schedule and budget

Step 2) Analyze Capabilities and Hazards

Where do you stand right now?
Review internal plans and policies
Meet with outside groups
Identify codes and regulations
Identify critical products, services, and operations
Identify internal resources and capabilities
Identify external resources
Do an insurance review

Conduct a Vulnerability Analysis
List potential emergencies
Estimate probability
Assess the potential human impact
Assess the potential property impact
Assess the potential business impact
Assess internal and external resources
Add the columns

Step 3) Develop the Plan

Plan Components
Executive summary
Emergency management elements
Emergency response procedures
Support documents

The Development Process
Identify challenges and prioritize activities
Write the plan
Establish a training schedule

Continue to coordinate with outside organizations
Maintain contact with other corporate offices
Review, conduct training, and revise
Seek final approval
Distribute the plan

Step 4) Implement the Plan

Integrate the Plan into Company Operations
Conduct Training
Planning considerations
Training activities
Employee training
Evaluate and modify the plan

Appendix A

Creation of the Task Force

1. Letter to Chancellor from Student Assembly, December 1994
2. Letter to Dr. Pogue from Campus Safety Planning Committee, December 1994
3. Letter to Chancellor Bartlett from Dr. Pogue, December 1994
4. Letter to Executive Committee of the Student Government Assembly from President Diego Munoz, July 1995
5. Letter to Chief Student Affairs Administrators from Dr. Pogue, August 1995
6. Letter to Dr. Bruce McBride from Chancellor establishing Task Force, September 1995

State University of New York
State University Plaza
Albany, New York 12246

Student Assembly of State University

MEMORANDUM

TO: Thomas Bartlett, Chancellor

FROM: William F. Weitz, President, Student Assembly

DATE: December 9, 1994

RE: Outlined proposal for Chancellor's Task Force on Public Safety

Objective

To create a Chancellor's Task Force on Public Safety which will establish a broad based plan founded on a number of principles that address categorical areas of safety. The Task Force will present this advisory plan to the Chancellor.

Abstract

The Task Force will devise, through research and compilation of information, a set of principles which will serve as a plan ~~on how~~ to address categorical areas of safety. These principles of safety are not meant in any way to formalize uniform police or citizen codes among SUNY campuses. They are, in fact, meant to provide the users of the plan with a systematic approach of general assessment that will assist in providing a broad based response to safety incidents. Specific policies and codes relevant to the categorical areas of the plan can then be carried out as seen fit by the campus.

Categorical areas of safety that may be relevant ~~principles~~ to the plan include, (but are not limited to): development of educational programming, residential life development, crime prevention techniques, health and counseling protocols, campus and facility accessibility, community policing, safety needs assessment models, sensitivity awareness and training, campus and community response to media, mediation services, etc.

Upon completion of this plan the Task Force will recommend it to the Chancellor for campus participation. To facilitate the plan campuses will need to charge their relevant campus safety committees with this feature.

The Task Force will also recommend to the Chancellor the initiation of an Advisory Committee which will provide post incident review on the ~~functionality and~~ success of the plan. The review will serve to fine-tune the plan's principles to incorporate new ideas or aspect of safety, while compiling information on what has and hasn't worked under specific circumstances. Ongoing, long term review of the plan will eventually facilitate numerous models of safety that best suit the campus environments of the SUNY system.

Structure

The Task Force will consist of 16 voting members, 1 staff member and several advisors.

(8) Administration & Faculty Component
- (5) One member will be appointed from University Centers
  One member will be appointed from University Colleges
  One member will be appointed from Agric. & Tech. Colleges
  One member will be appointed from Specialized Colleges
  One member will be appointed from Community Colleges
- (1) One member of the President's Council
- (1) One member of the Faculty Senate
- (1) One member of the Faculty Council

It is advised that Administrative & Faculty appointments be representative of the various geographic and demographic region of the state. It is also advised that they be representative of the various levels and divisions within the State University system.

(8) Student Component
- (5) One member will be appointed from University Centers
  One member will be appointed from University Colleges
  One member will be appointed from Agric. & Tech. Colleges
  One member will be appointed from Specialized Colleges
  One member will be appointed from Community Colleges
- (3) Student Assembly at-large appointments

It is advised that the Student appointments be representative of the different class ranks and age groups within the population.

(1) Staff Component
- (1) Non-voting staff

(3) Advising Component
- (1) Assistant Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Affirmative Action
- (1) Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Public Safety
- (1) Director of Disability Services and Information

Duration

The Task Force will serve for the duration of 9 months to one year in preparing its report for the Chancellor.

State University of New York
State University Plaza
Albany, New York 12246

STUDENT AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS
University Public Safety

December 16, 1994

MEMORANDUM

To: Frank G. Pogue
Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
and Special Programs

From: Campus Safety Planning Committee

William Murabito
Gladys Gould
Kristin Little
Bruce McBride
William Weitz

Subject: Task Force on Campus Safety

This memorandum will review our recent discussion regarding the creation of a University-wide Task Force on Campus Safety. Students, staff and visitors have increasingly become the victims of violence, which negatively impacts the institution's mission of social and academic development, campus climate and community relations.

This problem cannot be dismissed as being a reflection of increased violence in society. There are a number of common conditions and many situations which are specific to the nature and environment of each institution which contributes to campus violence:

- increased use of alcohol;
- strained relationships between students and community populations;
- polarization and segregation of student groups;
- public access to campuses making them easy targets;
- changing demographics of campus populations;
- students' feelings of invulnerability;
- various levels of involvement of campus officials in off-campus activities;
- movement of students from campus residence halls to off-campus student housing resulting in the development of student neighborhoods within the community;

- confusion/disagreement of the policing role of campus public safety departments;
- increased access to weapons;
- increased number of off-campus activities, especially those where alcohol is being served;
- student/non-student bar culture.

These contributing factors are often interrelated, resulting in very complex problems. Thoughtful care is required in developing strategies to address campus and university-wide situations. Many constituencies are involved and their input should be considered.

We recommend that a University-wide Campus Safety Task Force be charged to review the factors contributing to the increased violence which our students and communities are exposed. The objectives of the Task Force would be to:

1. Assist in developing and cataloging educational programs relevant to safety issues;
2. Identify programs successfully implemented by campus safety committees;
3. Review and, if necessary, recommend changes in University policies and practices;
4. Establish response protocols for serious crime and disaster incidents that might be adopted by campuses;
5. Identify model programs addressing campus safety problems.

The Task Force would consist of faculty, students and staff representative of our geographic and demographic regions of the state and the various organization levels within the State University system. At this time, we envision membership for the group to be as follows:

1. A campus president to chair the Task Force
2. Twelve student members recommended by the Student Assembly
3. Two faculty members, one recommended by the University Faculty Senate, and one recommended by the Faculty Council, and an Academic Affairs Administrator

4. A representative from each of the following University-wide Organizations:Chief Student Affairs Officers (State-Operated Campuses), Chief Student Affairs Officers (Community Colleges), Public Safety Directors Association, SUNY Business Officers Association, Community College Business Officers, housing Officers Association, SUNY Judicial Affairs Organization, Association of Councils and Trustees, and Association of Boards of Trustees for Community Colleges.

5. A representative from each of the following System Administration Offices: Office of Student Affairs and Special Programs, Counsel's Office, and the Office of Capital Facilities.

6. The following Offices will serve in an advisory capacity and will be consulted as necessary: Diversity and Affirmative Action, Legislative Relations, Employee Relations, System Communications and Public Relations, and Community Colleges.

Because safety is essential for successful teaching, research and social activity, the Task Force is likely to receive a great deal of attention. While we will gather some national information, we will also be presenting response models and programs that may be used extensively throughout the University. Please be advised that a great deal of background material developed for the 1992 Task Force on Public Safety can be used for these discussions.

Pending your approval, we will identify participants and convene the Task Force in February 1995. Thank you for your review of the above proposal.

State University of New York
State University Plaza
Albany, New York 12246

Office of the Vice Chancellor
for Student Affairs
and Special Programs

December 19, 1994

MEMORANDUM

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
RECEIVED
OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

DEC 20 1994
AM 7,8,9,10,11,12,1,2,3,4,5,6 PM

To: Thomas A. Bartlett, Chancellor

From: Frank G. Pogue
Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
and Special Programs

Subject: Task Force on Campus Safety

The enclosed memorandum, developed through a collaborative effort of the Student Assembly and the Office of Student Affairs, outlines a recommendation to establish a task force on campus safety. Such a task force has been under consideration for a period of time and I recommend that we proceed with this initiative.

The names of the task force members will be identified by the first week in January. The appointment letter should come under your signature; a draft appointment letter will be prepared for your review and approval.

The issue of campus safety has received a great deal of national discussion, including a number of dramatic examples from SUNY campuses. Since it is quite possible that a Board member may raise questions concerning this issue, I recommend you announce the establishment of the task force at the Wednesday, December 21 meeting of the Board. This would be a pro-active step and instill the notion that we are out in front on the issue.

Thank you for your help in this matter. Let me know if there are questions.

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Murabito
Dr. McBride
Mr. Weitz

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Telephone: 518-443-5137

518-443-5223 FAX

STUDENT ASSEMBLY

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
STATE UNIVERSITY PLAZA S25
ALBANY NEW YORK 12246

(518) 443-5118
FAX (518) 443-5120

July 7, 1995

To: Executive Committee
Student Government Presidents

From: Diego Muñoz, President

Re: SUNY's Task Force of Campus Safety

This past January the Student Assembly played an integral role in the initiation of a state-wide Task Force of Campus Safety. The purpose of this task force is to review campus safety programs at each of our campuses and develop working models that offer the best in campus safety for all our campuses.

As our campuses move to try to stymie the growth of criminal activity we should all work together to share those ideas that work and those that don't. As the consumers of the SUNY system, we as students must play a significant role in providing for our own safety. This task force allows student leaders to do so on a state-wide level, while working their own campus.

Attached you'll find the official charge for the Task Force of Campus Safety. The charge describes the intentions and tasks of the task force. To be considered for appointment to this task force, one must do the following:

1.) Be a SUNY student
2.) Nominate oneself or be nominated by another student. (must be in writing with address and telephone number of nominee)
3.) Submit a letter of recommendation from a college administrator or student government official

Submissions shall be considered until all seats are filled, thus the Student Assembly will have a roll in the nomination process with interval deadlines. The first deadline will be August 1, 1995. Please send all nominations and recommendations to the address above. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (518) 443-5118.

cc: Dr. Marion Schrank, Task Force Chair
DM/kc

S.U.N.Y.
COLLEGE AT BROCKPORT
RECEIVED
JUL 13 1995
FACULTY SENATE
BROCKPORT, NY 1442

TASK FORCE ON CAMPUS SAFETY

Charge and Composition

The University-wide Task Force on Campus Safety is charged to review the factors contributing to the increased violence which our students and communities are exposed. The objectives of the Task Force would be to:

1. Assist in developing and cataloging educational programs relevant to safety issues;

2. Identify programs successfully implemented by campus safety committees;

3. Review and, if necessary, recommend changes in University policies and practices;

4. Establish response protocols for serious crime and disaster incidents that might be adopted by campuses;

5. Identify model programs addressing campus safety problems.

The Task Force would consist of faculty, students and staff representative of our geographic and demographic regions of the state and the various organization levels within the State University system. Membership for the group will be as follows:

1. A campus president to chair the Task Force *

2. Twelve student members recommended by the Student Assembly

3. Two faculty members, one recommended by the University Faculty Senate, and one recommended by the Faculty Council, and an Academic Affairs Administrator

4. A representative from each of the following University-wide Organizations; Chief Student Affairs Officers (State-Operated Campuses), Chief Student Affairs Officers (Community Colleges), Public Safety Directors Association, SUNY Business Officers Officers Association, Community College Business Officers, Housing Officers Association, SUNY Judicial Affairs Organization, Association of Councils and Trustees, and Association of Boards of Trustees for Community Colleges.

5. A representative from each of the following System Administration Offices: Office of Student Affairs and Special Programs, Counsel's Offices, and the Office of Capital Facilities.

6. The following Offices will serve in an advisory capacity and will be be consulted as necessary: Diversity and Affirmative Action, Legislative Relations, Employee Relations, System Communications and Public Relations and Community Colleges.

Because safety is essential for successful teaching, research and social activity, the Task Force is likely to receive a great deal of attention While we will gather some national information, we will also be presenting response models and programs that may be used extensively throughout the University. Please be advised that a great deal of background material developed for the 1992 Task Force on Public Safety can be used for these discussions.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

CHANCELLOR FOR
STUDENT AFFAIRS AND
SPECIAL PROGRAMS

System Administration
State University Plaza
Albany, NY 12246

518/443-5137
FAX 518/443-5223

BITNET:
POGUEFG@SNYCENVM

August 22, 1995

MEMORANDUM

To: Chief Student Affairs Administrators

From: Frank G. Pogue
Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
and Special Programs

Subject: University-wide Safety Task Force

Chancellor Bartlett has authorized the creation of a University-wide Safety Task Force. The task force will be chaired by Dr. Marion Schrank, Vice Presidents for Student Affairs at Brockport, and will consist of faculty, students and staff representative of our geographic and demographic regions of the state, and the various organization levels within the State University system.

We are establishing this task force due to the increase of incidents involving personal safety on our campuses this past academic year. The objectives of the task force are: (l) help in developing and cataloging education programs about safety issues; (2) identify programs successfully started by campus safety committees; (3) review and, if necessary, recommend changes in University policies and practices; (4) establish response protocols for serious crime and disaster incidents that campuses might adopt; (5) identify model programs addressing campus safety problems.

As I am sure we all agree, safety is essential for successful teaching, research and social activity. Therefore, the task force will work diligently and responsively to address issues that interfere with the educational mission of the university.

If there are any questions regarding the above, please contact Dr. Bruce McBride or myself at (518) 443-5116.

Copy: Chancellor Bartlett
Presidents, State University of New York
Executive Council

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

STATE UNIVERSITY PLAZA
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12246
(518) 443-5355

1948

Thomas A. Bartlett, Chancellor

September 15, 1995

Dr. R. Bruce McBride
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Student Affairs and Public Safety
State University of New York
State University Plaza
Albany, New York 12246

Dear Dr. McBride:

During this past academic year, several incidents involving personal safety have occurred on our campuses. These episodes that appear to reflect the general escalation of violent crime nationwide cause us to reflect that the right to live and learn in an environment without fear of personal harm is being compromised. Students, staff, and visitors have become victims of violence that negatively affects the university's mission of teaching, research, and social development.

To fully address these issues, I am establishing a university-wide task force on campus safety that will convene in the fall of 1995, to research actively and recommend solutions to campus and university-wide problems. I would like to extend an invitation to you to serve on this task force. I feel confident that your participation and expertise will contribute greatly to the success of this important endeavor.

I have enclosed a memorandum prepared by the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Special Programs Frank G. Pogue which details the charge of the task force. If you accept this invitation to serve on the task force, please telephone Dr. Pogue at (518) 443-5137. Thank you for your assistance with this project.

Cordially,

Thomas A. Bartlett
Chancellor

Enclosure

THIS LETTER WAS SENT TO THE PEOPLE ON THE ATTACHED LIST

Appendix B

Letter to Student Assembly President from Dr. Marion Schrank, June 3, 1996

UNIVERSITY-WIDE TASK FORCE ON
CAMPUS SAFETY
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Dr. Marion Schrank, Chair
(716) 395-2137—Fax: (716) 395-5602
MSCHRANK@BROCKVMA.CC.BROCKPORT.EDU

Gladys Gould, Student Affairs & Public Safety
(518) 443-5116—Fax: (518) 443-5387
GOULDFGL@CA.SUNYCENTRAL.EDU

June 3, 1996

Dr. Diego Munoz
President
Student Assembly
State University of New York
State University Plaza, N525
Albany, NY 12246

Dear Diego:

Enclosed you will find a copy of the latest communication to the University-wide Task Force on Campus Safety. Enclosed is a list of students who were selected to serve on this committee. Due to the difficulty in contacting students at this time of year, I am corresponding with you to convey my interest in obtaining student input.

As you can see from the enclosed letter, we are preparing to submit our final "draft" report. It is my utmost concern that we have student participation and direct influence on this important issue that so directly impacts them as the primary constituents of our college communities. I am soliciting your opinion and direction as to what we can do to have a student "voice" for the August meeting.

Thank you for your support of this project and I hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

Dr. Marion Schrank
Vice President for Student Affairs at SUNY Brockport
Chair, University-wide Task Force on Campus Safety

XC: Mr. Simon Johnson, President of the Student Assembly (1996-1997)
Dr. McBride, Gladys Gould

Appendix C

Task Force Membership

Task Force Membership

Members of the University-wide Task Force on Campus Safety

Administration and Faculty

Dr. Dallas Bauman
Assistant Vice President
Campus Residences
SUNY Stony Brook

Mr. John Coffey
Associate Director
Physical Plant Support Services
State University Construction Fund
System Administration

Mr. Richard Collier
Coordinator, Advisement Services
SUNY Albany

Ms. Marti Anne Ellermann, Esq.
SUNY Counsel's Office
System Administration

Mr. Thomas Gebhardt
Office of Personal Safety/Off-Campus Affairs
SUNY Albany

Mr. Robert Garrow
Chairman of the College Council
SUNY Plattsburgh

Ms. Gladys Gould
Student Affairs Programs/Training
Systems Administration

Mr. James Grant
Vice President for Administration
SUNY New Paltz

Ms. Nancy Langer
College Board of Trustees
Finger Lakes Community College

Dr. Bruce McBride
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Student Affairs/Public Safety
System Administration

Dr. William Murabito
Associate Vice Chancellor
Student Affairs
System Administration

Dr. Hal Payne
Vice President for Student Affairs
SUNY College at Buffalo

Mr. Richard Reese, Vice President
Financial/Administrative Services
Finger Lakes Community College

Mr. Thomas Ryan
Assistant Vice President for Public Safety
SUNY Oswego

Mr. Peter Sanzen
Professor, Criminal Justice
Hudson Valley Community College

Dr. Marion Schrank
Vice President for Student Affairs
SUNY Brockport

Ms. Christine Strong
Interim Vice President for Student Affairs
SUNY Potsdam

Mr. Richard Sush
Dean of Students
Sullivan Community College

Task Force Membership

Student Membership

Adam Gentile
SUNY Plattsburgh

Edward Jones
State University College at Buffalo

Justin Kisiday
SUNY Cobleskill

Anthony LaMacchia
SUNY Brockport

Monique Loudon
SUNY New Paltz

Andrew Proto
SUNY Brockport

LaJoie Rice
Monroe Community College

Ahmad Sahar
SUNY Oneonta

Mark Seaman
Broome Community College

Clyde Venel
SUNY Farmingdale

Subcommittee Membership

Education

Hal Payne, Chair
Gladys Gould, Facilitator
Dallas Bauman
Tom Gebhardt
Richard Reese
Edward Jones
Ahmad Sahar

Prevention and Compliance

Christine Strong, Chairperson
Marion Schrank, Facilitator
Marti Anne Ellermann
Robert Garrow
Thomas Ryan
Anthony LaMacchia
Andrew Proto

Crisis Management

John Coffey, Chairperson
Bruce McBride, Facilitator
Richard Collier
James Grant
Peter Sanzen

Resources

This reference list is compiled from the subcommittee reports. It is offered as representative and not conclusive of all materials and resources on these topics.

Resources

Adams, A., & Abarbanel, G. (1988). Sexual assault on campus: What colleges can do. Rape Treatment Center, Santa Monica Hospital, Santa Monica, CA.

Amada, G. (1994). Coping with the disruptive college student: A practical model. Asheville: College Administration Publications.

Asmussen, K. J., & Creswell, J. W. (1995). Campus response to a student gunman. Journal of Higher Education, 66 No. 5. Ohio State University Press.

Barr, M. (1983). Student affairs and the law. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Berkowitz, A. (1994). Men and rape: Theory, research, and prevention in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Black, D. (1992). Just ask! Answers to common legal questions in higher education. Madison: Magna Publications.

Bogal-Allbritten, R., & Allbritten, W. (1991). Courtship violence on campus: A nationwide survey of student affairs professionals. NASPA Journal, 28.

Bogal-Allbritten, R., & Allbritten, W. (1985). The hidden victims: Courtship violence among college students. Journal of College Student Personal, 26 (201–204).

Bromley, C., & Territo, L. (1991). College crime and prevention and personal safety awareness. Springfield, IL: C. C. Thomas Publishers.

Brown, V., & Buttolph, E. (Eds.). (1993). Student disciplinary issues: A legal compendium. National Association of College and University Attorneys.

Bryan, W. A., & Mullendorn, R. H. (1992). Rights, freedoms, and responsibilities of students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Burling, P. (1991). Crime and campus: Analyzing and managing the increasing risk of institutional liability. National Association of College and University Attorneys.

Burling, P. (1993). Crime on campus: "I think someone is following me." Association of Governing Board of Universities and Colleges.

Campus safety for women. (1992, Feb.). Report of the Senate Democratic Task Force on Women's Issues.

Campuses must tell crime rates. (1991, Winter). Legislative Update, 31.

College security report. (1988). Newsletter of Public Safety, Crime Prevention, Asset Protection, Liability Insurance.

Complete campus crime prevention model. (1996, May). Goshen, KY: Campus Crime Prevention Programs.

Coomes, M. E., & Gehring, D. (1994). Student services in a changing federal climate. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Crime prevention and security for student residence facilities: A manual for college and university law enforcement officers and housing administrators and staff. (1991). Goshen, KY: Campus Crime Prevention Program.

Dealing with campus crime: Rape, murder, and other violent acts, 1. (1990). New York: Rusting Publications.

Dealing with campus crime: Rape, murder, and other violent acts, 2. (1991). New York: Rusting Publications.

Flooding closes two Iowa universities. (1993, July 21). Chronicle of Higher Education.

Gibbs, A. (1992). Reconciling rights and responsibilities of colleges and students. School of Education and Human Development. George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Handling crime prevention on campus. (1995). Hartford: International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators.

Handling special events on campus. (1995). Hartford: International Association of College Law Enforcement Administrators.

Hate crimes. (1991, August 1). IACP National Law Enforcement Policy Center, Concepts and Issues Paper.

Helping people cope with disaster. (1994, September 21). Chronicle of Higher Education.

Hoekema, D. A. (Fall 1992). Campus rules and moral community—in place of *in loco parenti* Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers. Johnson K. (1992, Fall). The Tip of the Iceberg. School Safety, 24–26.

Inundation in Georgia. (1994, July 20). Chronicle of Higher Education.

Jones, D. J. (1990). The college campus as a microcosm of U.S. society: The issue of racially motivated violence. Urban League Review, 13 (129–39).

Keller, D. P. (1992). A practical guide for college and university administrators. Goshen, KY: Campus Crime Prevention Programs.

Keller, D. P. (1992). Rape…Awareness, Education, Prevention, and Response. Goshen, KY: Campus Crime Prevention Programs.

Kirkland, C. J., & Siegel, D. G. (1994). Campus security: A first look at promising practices. Washington, D.C.: Educational Resource Information Center.

Leadership team to meet to plan future course. (1996, Jan.). NACAS NEWS, Vol. 28.

McGoey, C. (1990). Security: Adequate…or not? The complete guide to premises, liabilities, litigation. Oakland, CA: Aegis Books.

Men and Rape: Theory, Research, and Prevention Programs in Higher Education. (1994). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

National research council forms board on disasters. (1992, September 9).

Chronicle of Higher Education.

Nichols, W. D. (1995, June). Violence on campus: The intruded sanctuary. FBI Law Enforcement and Bulletin.

Northeast Missouri state finds lesson in floods. (1993, December 1). Chronicle of Higher Education.

Palmer, C. J. (1993). Violent crimes and other forms of victimization in residence halls. Asheville: College Administration Publications.

Pavela, G. (1985). The dismissal of students with mental disorders: Legal issues, policy considerations and alternative responses. Asheville: College Administration Publications, Inc.

Preventing violence on college campuses. (1987). Journal of Counseling and Development, 65 (367–70).

Responding to campus crime: A guide for administrators. (1990). United Educators Insurance Risk Prevention Group.

Richardson, R. C., & Fisk Skinner, E. (1991). Achieving quality and diversity, universities in a multicultural society. American Council on Education. Macmillan Publishing Company.

Saland, S. M. (1993). A false sense of security? The reality of violence on campus. New York: New York State Senate Majority Task Force on Campus Security.

Sherrill, J. M., & Siegel, D. G. (1989). Responding to violence on campus. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Siegel, D. (1994). Campuses respond to violent tragedy. Phoenix: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.

Smith, M. C., & Fossey, R. (1995). Crime on campus: Legal issues and campus administration. Phoenix: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.

Stage, F. K., & Manning, K. (1992). Enhancing the multicultural environment: A cultural brokering approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Standards for campus law enforcement security and public safety agencies. (1995). Hartford: International Association of campus Law Enforcement Administrators.

Stoner, R., & Cerminara, K. (1990). Harnessing the "spirit of insubordination": A model student disciplinary code. Journal of College and University Law, 89.

Students feeling less safe on campus. (1995, July 3). National On-Campus Report.

SUNY personal safety annual report 1993–1994. (1995, July). State University of New York System Administration Division of Student Affairs and Special Programs Office of Student Affairs and University Public Safety.

Training guide for hate crime data collection. U.S. Department of Justice Federal Bureau of Investigation.

University of California president sets seismic safety plans. (1989, November 29). Chronicle of Higher Education.

University issues report on recovery from earthquake. (1995, January 20). Chronicle of Higher Education.

Wechsler, H., Dowall, G., Davenport, A., & DeJong, W. (Eds.). (ED/OPE95–8). Binge drinking on campus: Results of a national study. Bethesda: Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention.

Weeks, K. M. (1996). Student handbook policies. Nashville: College Legal Information.

Willis, S. B., & Hines, E. R. (1995, November). Perceptions of residence hall security. Journal of College Students Development, 35.

Winston, Jr., R. B., Andrews, S., & Associates. Student housing and residential

life. Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Video Tapes

Intent vs. impact (Employee version). Provides guidelines for determining the difference between behavior that is okay and behavior that constitutes subtle sexual harassment. Participant's Manual available.

It's no game Provides an overview of definitions, prevention, and ramifications and psychological impact of sexual harassment. Includes segment of "Cagney and Lacey." Instructor's Guide available.

The power pinch* and The Workplace Hustle** Deals with sexual harassment in the workplace. *Instructor's Guide available; **Instructor's Guide not available.

Take back the day: Stopping peer sexual harassment on campus Using assertive student role models, the video teaches students a wide variety of strategies for taking control of the situation and stopping harassment.

Tell someone A program for combating sexual harassment. Staff and student versions. Instructor's Guide available.

You are the game: Sexual harassment on campus Dramatizes the situations of two women college students who have experienced different forms of sexual harassment.

Your right to fight: Stopping sexual harassment on campus Depicts harassment and victims in scenes which illustrate typical aspects of sexual harassment in educational settings.

Additional Resources

Campus Crime. A monthly newsletter. Maryland: Business Publishers.

Campus Safety, Health and Environmental Management Association (CSHEMA). Formerly known as the Campus Safety Association (CSA).

Campus Security Report. A monthly newsletter. New York: Rusting Publications.

Disaster preparedness: Plan of action and disaster roster. (1996, April). Albany, NY: New York State Department of Labor.

Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), U.S. Department of Education.

The final report of the Buffalo State College alcohol and other drug abuse prevention program. Grant. Funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education.

International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA).

New York state disaster preparedness plan. Albany, NY: New York State Emergency Management Office.

State University Construction Fund Office of Physical Plant Support Services, State University Plaza, Albany, NY. (Campus Physical Plant and Construction Emergencies)

State University of New York Office of Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Public Safety, State University Plaza, Albany, NY. (Campus Public Safety)

Internet Resources and Information

World Wide Web Sites:

American Red Cross	http://www.crossnet.org/
Department of Education	http://www.ed.gov/offices/ope/ppi/security.htlm
Department of Justice Violence Against Women	http://www.usoj.gov/vawo

Federal Emergency Management Agency	http://www.fema.gov/./
National Institutes of Health	http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/flood.html
New York State Association of Counties	http://www.state.ny.us/nysac/
New York State Government Information Locator	http://www.nysl.nysed.gov/ils/
New York State Emergency Management Office	http://nyslgti.gen.ny.ns/SEMO/home.html
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	http://www.usace.army.mil/index.html
U.S. Department of Transportation	http://www.dot.gov/

World Wide Web site on Campus Safety:

Higher Education Center World Wide Web site for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention http://www.edc.org/hec

Additional educational safety programs and information was also obtained from the Internet by conducting a "Net Search" under the topics of "safety" and "campus safety." http://222.ualberta.ca/~rrichard/cshema.html

Emergency Procedures/Protocols/Practices/Programs from various campuses:

On file at SUNY System Office of Student Affairs/Public Safety